A

DISCOURSE

OF THE

NECESSITY

OF

Church-Guides,

For Directing Christians in *Necessary Faith.*

WITH

Some ANNOTATIONS on Dr *Stillingfleet's* Answer to *N. O.*

By *R. H.*

Matt. 18. 17.—*Si* ECCLESIAM *non audiverit, sit tibi sicut Ethnicus & Publicanus.*

2 Cor. 6. 8.—*Ut Seductores, &* VERACES.

Printed in the Year, M.DC.LXXV.

A

DISCOURSE

OF THE

NECESSITY

OF

Church-Guides,

For Directing Christians in Necessary Duty.

WITH

Some ANNOTATIONS on Dr Stillingfleet's

Answer to N. C.

By R. H.

Printed in the Year, MDCLXXV.

THE PREFACE.

BEfore my entrance upon the following Diſcourſe it ſeems neceſſary to pre-acquaint the Reader with the occaſion thereof.

§. 1.

Doctor Stillingfleet *at the end of his Book of the* Roman Idolatry, *upon his Adverſary's importunity, publiſhed* Thirty Principles *drawn up* (*as he ſaith immediatly before them*) ‖ to give an Account of the Proteſtants Faith, in the way of Principles. ‖ p. 557.

In the 13*th of which he affirms*——That the Scriptures may be underſtood by all perſons who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their ſalvation. *Again in the* 15*th.*——That theſe Writings contain in them the whole Will of God ſo plainly revealed, that no ſober enquirer can miſs of what is neceſſary for ſalvation. *Again in the* 19*th*——That the aſſiſtance which God hath promiſed to thoſe who ſincerely deſire to know his Will [*where I ſuppoſe he means ſuch aſſiſtance as includes not that which God hath promiſed to Chriſtians from the direction and inſtruction of his Miniſters; for, this aſſiſtance here is oppoſed by him to that*] may give them greater aſſurance of the truth of what is contained in the Books of Scripture, than it is poſſible for the greateſt Infallibility in any other perſons to do, ſuppoſing they have not ſuch aſſurance of their Infallibility. [*Where you may obſerve that it follows much more*, may give them greater aſſurance, than it is poſſible for the higheſt Church-Authority, Wiſdome, Learning, or Divine aſſiſtance, ſhort of Infallibility, in any other perſons to do]. *And ſo in his* firſt Conſequence *he ſaith*——There is no neceſſity at all or uſe of an infallible [*I add, much leſs of a fallible*] ſociety of men to aſſure men of the truth of thoſe things of which they may be certain without [*them*]; and cannot have any greater aſſurance [*than that they have already*] ſuppoſing ſuch Infallibility to be in them.

§. 2.

Theſe his Principles *were conſidered; and eſpecially the* forenamed *oppoſed, by a Roman Catholick; as appearing to him not only untrue, but of moſt dangerous conſequence; as being very derogative from Church-Authority, as to theſe chief parts of their Office, the* Expounding *of the* Scriptures; *the Teaching and Guiding Chriſt's Flock*

Flock in all Truth neceſſary to be known by them; and their Defining *alſo matters of Neceſſary Faith, as* Controverſies *in them do ariſe, and Requiring from their Subjects a Belief of them; and alſo very hazardous to mens ſalvation, in leaving each private perſon to entertain in Religion, eſpecially as to points thought more neceſſary (in which therefore the Scriptures alſo are affirmed by the Doctor more plain), what in his own judgment, after a to-him-ſeeming ſincere peruſal of them, he likes beſt; even though a much major part of Chriſtianity, reading the ſame Scriptures, aſſert the contrary; and this without any obligation of ſubmitting his judgment in ſuch things to his* Spiritual Superiours.

§. 3. *And indeed from ſome ſuch* Principle *it ſeems to be; that* Luther, (*when he had ſaid to himſelf*‖——Tu ſolus ſapis? Totne errant, univerſi? *And*--Quoties mihi palpitavit tremulum cor?) *reencouraged himſelf to proceed in his* Reformation, *though contradicting the whole World*; viz. *Becauſe the* Scriptures *were* cleare, *and for him, againſt them all: often uſing S.* Paul's——Licet Angelus de Cælo, *&c. Gal.* 1. *The Holy Scriptures the reſt of the Chriſtian World had read as well as himſelf, but he meanwhile was conſcious only of his own ſincere endeavour; and ſo the* Principle *ſecured him that he did not miſtake, if any ſuch point were neceſſary, wherein he oppoſed them.* *From ſuch* Principle *was the confidence of the* Proteſtants, *then but a very few, againſt the ſacred* Council *of* Trent, *i.e. all the other Church-Governours of that Age; when they deſired, that the Authority of the Fathers might be qualified with a*——Fundantes ſe in Scripturis. *Of which* fundantes, *whether it were ſo, or no, they themſelves, for themſelves at leaſt, would be the Judges.*

‖ *De abrogand. Miſſa privat. præfat.*

Soave Hiſt. Conc. Trid. p. 344. 641.

From ſuch a Principle, *the* Socinians *departed from the whole Church of God, Ancient, Modern, only pleading the Scriptures clear on their ſide. See* Volkelius *De Vera Relig. l.* 5. *c.* 7.——Præſertim (*ſaith he*) ſi ſapientiam a Deo petat, quam ille nemini denegat: *i.e. if uſing their prayers and ſincere endeavours, though not conſulting or obeying any Guides, or the Church;*--Quam in iis quoq; rebus, quæ ad ſalutem ſunt neceſſariæ errare conſtat. *From ſuch Principle it is that the* Presbyterians‖ *denied Subſcription to the* 39. *Articles except this clauſe were added,* [ſo far forth as the ſame Articles were agreeable to Gods Word] *of which,* [how farre] *they make themſelves the Judges; And ſo alſo do the many latter* Sects; *who, for a ſufficient knowledge in all neceſſary points and triall of the Doctrine of their Teachers therein, need nothing more than a* Bible, *and learning to* read. *From ſuch* Principle *that Mr.* Chillingworth *denies that any* Church-Authority (*not excepting the firſt four General Councils,*)

‖ *Reaſons ſhewing Neceſſity of Reform. p.* 5.

Councils,) *hath juſt cauſe to oblige others to receive their* Declarations *in matters of Faith.* ‖ *And elſewhere ſaith* †——That the Bible, the Bible only is the Religion of Proteſtants: and that the belief of any thing beſides Scripture, and the plain irrefragable indubitable conſequences of it [*indubitable,* i.e. *to thoſe, on whom they are impoſed*] cannot [*i.e. by Proteſtants*] with coherence to their own grounds be required of any without moſt high and moſt Schiſmatical preſumption. *From ſuch* Principle, *that Dr* Stillingfleet *accuſeth the whole Church Catholick, Eaſtern and Weſtern, for ſo many Ages before the Reformation, of ſo manifold an* Idolatry; *where his own ſincere endeavour to underſtand the Scriptures in ſo neceſſary a point, he holds, cannot be miſtaken; and therefore all that World muſt be ſo. And thus what opinion may not* One *maintain againſt* all, *if he have firſt a confidence concerning himſelf, that he hath uſed a requiſite induſtry* (*which induſtry alſo muſt not be maintained greater than the meaneſt condition of life may practiſe*); *and ſo, that Scripture is clear to him in all neceſſary matters; and, Next,* (*the conſequent of this*) *if he have a perſwaſion concerning others, how many ſoever,* (*whom, by their differing from him, he knows to be in an errour*), *that either they have been defective in a* ſincere enquiry; *or, having, with him, diſcerned the Truth, yet for ſome ſecular ends* falſify it?

‖ c. 4. §. 18.
† c. 6. §. 5.

§. 4.

From this Principle, *alſo proceeds that Aſſertion; That there is amongſt Chriſtians no Neceſſity of any other* Judge (*infallible, and much leſs fallible,*) *ſave* Scripture *only, for deciding Controverſies in any points neceſſary: which ſeems to engage the Aſſertors to the maintaining alſo of one of theſe two very harſh* Propoſitions; *either,* [1] *That all ſuch points, as are in controverſy among Chriſtians, are no Neceſſaries; but that it muſt paſs for a matter of* leſs moment, *as any thing becomes* diſputed: *and particularly, No neceſſity of believing or practiſing on the Proteſtants ſide, for his attaining of ſalvation, any of the points agitated between them and the* Roman-Catholicks: *Which Propoſition ſeems of a very hard digeſtion to be allowed & abetted by thoſe Reformers eſpecially, who make ſuch Declamations againſt the hainouſneſs of the* Roman corruptions *of the ſenſe of Scripture even in the higheſt matters of* God's Worſhip, *and* Myſteries *of our* Redemption: *As, in* giving the Divine Worſhip to a Creature; *in the doctrine of* Juſtification; Merit of mens good Works. *&c. Or* [2] *engageth them elſe to the maintaining of this other propoſition; that, though the Scriptures are ſo clear in ſome of thoſe points in controverſy* (*for, ſo they ſay they are in all* Neceſſaries), *as that no illiterate perſon uſing a convenient endeavour can miſtake in them, yet* de facto *that the much* Major part *of the Chriſtian world, having and peruſing*

the

the ſame Scriptures, is and hath been miſtaken in them for many ages; and hath thought the Scriptures clear to the contrary: which ſeems, on the other ſide, a thing as hard and incredible; viz. *to deny to ſo* many *Men and Ages, for underſtanding the Scriptures, the uſing of ſuch a* juſt endeavour, *as any unlearned Proteſtant doth, or may employ.*

§. 5. *Laſtly; from this* Principle *ſeems naturally to proceed, in ſuch a Church as holds it, a* Toleration *of all Opinions that pretend Scriptures for themſelves (however it comes about that thoſe of* Roman-Catholicks *find little favour by it); becauſe there is no juſt reaſon of ſuppreſſing the aſſertions of any party, where is no competent* Judge *of deciding the truth in them, ſave the ſame* Scriptures *which, read by both ſides, yet do not end the Debate. A* Toleration *of all Opinions I ſay (ſave perhaps ſuch as invade and diſturbe the Civil Peace and Government). Among which opinions tolerated alſo ſome* ‖ 1 Cor. 11. 19. *will be Hereſies,* ‖ *unleſs theſe men tell us, by what Judge theſe ſhall be declared ſuch, and ſo excluded. That Toleration of opinions was a* † See ch. 4. §. 38. &c. *Conſequence of this Principle Mr* Chillingworth † *clearly ſaw; and ſo pleaded much for it, as only well conſiſtent with Proteſtant Grounds. Of which ſee more below.* §. 96.

§. 6. *Upon ſuch* Conſequences *as theſe, then,* N.O. *was moved to write ſome brief* Conſiderations *and Reflections on theſe* Principles; *obſerving herein the Method that they preſcribed to him. But now, ſince Dr* Stillingfleet *hath not at all followed the ſame (though his own) order in his* Reply (*whereby would more clearly have appeared the many things therein that have received no anſwer*) *I alſo in this Rejoinder ſhall take the liberty to change the former method of the* Conſiderations, *and briefly to repeat* N.O's *Conceptions eſpecially ſuch as relate to the forementioned* Principles, *reduced into ſuch an order as they may be more applicable thereto; and then conſider, how far the Dr's Replies have rebated their force, or confirmed his own Poſitions. And, after this done, leſt a conſiderable part of the Dr's Book, expatiating to other ſubjects, which, if nothing pertinent to* N.O's Conſiderations, *yet may appear to ſome very important to the* Proteſtant Cauſe, *may ſeem unſpoken to, I ſhall accompany the Reader through his whole Book with* Annotations, *following his Diſcourſe whither it leads me), on the paſſages that appear to me more remarkable: and ſo I ſhall leave all to the judgment of the prudent and piouſly diſpoſed, of what preſent perſwaſion ſoever, who, not zealous for a party, ſeeks after* Truth.

§. 7. *Only I am firſt to acquaint him with this in general: That the two main Pleas of the Dr, and* N.O, (*as to a Chriſtian's attaining a right belief in all* neceſſaries *to* ſalvation) *are* Obedience and ſubmiſſion

of

of Judgments to the Church's Determinations, *on the one side*; *and* every Christian's Liberty of Judgment *in their* peruſing the Scriptures, *on the other. Where he will eaſily diſcover, that the intereſt of thoſe, who contend for* Liberty, *engaged by ſuch perſons, to deny and evacuate the* Infallibility *and non-miſtaking of any* Eccleſiaſtical Guides, *even as to the ſame* Neceſſaries, *wherein yet they affirm the* Clearneſs *of* Scripture *to every Chriſtian uſing a right endeavour*; *ſo that none can ſafely herein adhere to their ſentence and judgment, wherein yet he may to his own. Again, their intereſt; to ſet forth to the uttermoſt the defects and failings of theſe* Guides; *their oppoſitions, and contradictions; and of every one ſo much the more, as he claims a greater Authority: and therefore no wonder, if the* Pope *is no better treated by them; To charge them, whether* Prelates *or* Synods, *with* paſſion, ambition, *covetouſneſs, or the like, in their proceedings: To rip up and publiſh any their infirmities or vices, whereby they may be thought leſs fit to be Guides of other mens Ignorance, or Conſcience; or* Judges *of their* Differences: *as if inferior and private perſons were free from ſuch paſſions and ſelf-intereſts; and not born in a ſtate, where ſome opinions better ſerved their profit & preferment than others, & where ſuch engagements clouded their Judgments.*

To preſs a non-neceſſity of Deciding Controverſies; *For, this thing would call for ſome publick Judge: And, To diminiſh and abridge points of* neceſſary Faith *as much as may be; Becauſe all ſuch points muſt be affirmed ſo* clear *that no honeſt endeavour can miſtake in them: and, becauſe thus the* Liberty of Opinion *in all other points may the better be juſtifyed, upon the account of their not being neceſſary: and to inveigh much againſt the* Multiplicity *of the Articles of* Faith, *that have been impoſed by the Church's Councils: To extend the Title of* Catholick *to all Churches profeſſing Chriſtianity. Becauſe theſe men allow no certain Judge to determine* Hereſy *or* Schiſme, *which may exclude any Church from being* Catholick; *and becauſe they hold only thoſe points to be neceſſary to ſalvation that are ſo cleare in Scripture, as that* all *Churches agree in them.* §. 8.

To plead much the Liberty and juſt authority of Particular *Churches, and of* Civil States, *to correct and reform within their Dominions whatſoever Errours and Corruptions in Religion. As indeed it is moſt neceſſary they ſhould thoſe, which firſt by a Lawful* Eccleſiaſtical Authority *are ſtated to be ſo. But, how ſuch* Errours *and corruptions ſhall firſt be certainly known and diſtinguiſhed from what are certain Truths, and lawful practices, which ought to precede a proceeding to reform them, This uſeth to be paſſed over by them in ſilence.* §. 9.

So; To ſpeak much of the lawful liberty and power of particular Churches & States to change, alter, improve, abolish, according to ſe-

veral Constitutions of the Civil Government) *things that are not* essential *to Christian Religion nor expresly prescribed by our Lord or his Apostles; but, to say nothing meanwhile, how, what are or are not such* Essentials, *or so commanded, shall certainly be known and decided; Yet which acting the other necessarily presupposeth the stating of this. But, wisely, little talk they have of this, because such thing would inferr a* Judge *in these matters beside Scripture.*

§. 10. *To* limit *the Authority of such Spiritual Guides; that it obligeth not, when any thing is repugnant to plain* Commands *of* Scripture (*which, it seems, either these Governours cannot see, or will dissemble*); *or, when any other way found not agreeable to Gods Word; and then judging, themselves, when it is, or is not so; Or* (*if their own judgment may seem too partial*) *making an appeale to the judgment of* Common Reason *against these* Guides; *as if both they, and the Major part of the Christian World that follow them, had no such faculty, or that this* Common Reason *were only in a few. Again that such authority obligeth not in any thing repugnant to the Evidence of* Sense; *as if either such evidence were not considered by these Persons in Authority; or, that they had not their senses so perfect, as other men. To distinguish between the* several Ages *of the Church; and allow more Authority to the Governours of the* past, (*as thinking themselves more out of their reach*); *than, of the* present. *To annul as much as in them is the* Subordinations *of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; or render them arbitrary and dependent on* Civil States; *and to level as much as may be their authority and Jurisdiction; introducing such a Polyarchy into the Catholick Church, as would not be endured in a Temporal Government; nor is indeed suffered by wise Princes in a* National *Church within their own Dominions.* ||*Conference at Hampt. Court.* [I will have one *Doctrine*, and one *Discipline*; one Religion in substance, and in Ceremony: *said* King James.||]

§. 11. *To inveigh against the Immunityes and priviledges of the Church, either given at first by our Lord, or added by the favour of Princes, when become her sons and subjects, and to suggest to them an invasion of their Rights; To mingle and confound the Jurisdiction of the* Ecclesiastical *and* Civil *state; and borrow aids from the one, as need is, to relieve their subjection to the other. To require a joint concurrence in the* Secular Power *for the ratification of all* Clergy-Acts, *though in purely Spiritual Matters; whereby neither any Church-Doctrine nor Government can be established in such State, which It prohibits; and contrary Constitutions and Laws and Reformations are introduced into the Church, as the secular Magistrate is variously inclined or informed; and Ecclesiastical Controversies transferr'd into the Civil Courts; they not so well observing the Consequen-*

ces

ces hereof, when a Julian or a Constantius appears; and that, if the ſecular Magiſtrate ſhould be of a Religion or Sect diſliked by them, (ſuppoſe a Presbyterian, or a Roman-Catholick) ſuch his Spiritual Authority turns to their diſadvantage; and that the ſame Eccleſiaſtical Rights of the Civil Power will deſtroy Proteſtancy elſewhere, as here ſupports it: And that (as S. Auſtin || minded the Donatiſts preferring a Secular judgment in their Cauſe before the Church's) —Judicium Illius [ſcil. Principis] quem Veſtri elegerunt, quem Judicibus Epiſcopis prætulerunt, juſtiſſime contra vos cuſtodietur. || Epiſt. 48.

§. 12.

To preſs much the Scriptures, that may ſeem to relate the Corruptions and fallings away of the Clergy; that bid us to beware of falſe Prophets, and to try the Spirits, and to adhere to the Goſpel (by which they can only mean, to that which in their own judgment is the ſenſe of it) though an Angel from heaven ſhould teach the contrary; to take heed of Seducers and falſe Guides, that ſhould appear in Chriſt's name (applying ſuch things to the Canonical Judicature of the Church, and not to themſelves rather) and to tell the people of Antichriſts that are to come, and ſtore of falſe Miracles that are to be done; That they are bid to prove all things, and hold that which is good [i.e. what they judge ſo] That if the blind lead the blind both muſt fall into the ditch: That the Apoſtles claimed no dominion over mens Faith &c. Matt. 24. 4, 5, 23, 24.—Act. 20. 29, 30.—2 Theſ. 2. 3.—1 Tim. 4. 1.—1 Joh. 4. 1.—Gal. 1. 8.

All theſe for a——Dirumpamus vincula eorum & projiciamus a nobis jugum ipſorum, I mean that Yoke of Church-Authority committed to theſe our Eccleſiaſtical Superiours by our Lord Chriſt Jeſus, and for the gaining freedome of judgment and liberty of opinion, and declining of Obedience. All which things, any way vilifying Superiours, and having ſomthing Satyrical in them, are ordinarily received with much applauſe by our corrupt Nature uncorrected by Grace; which loves to have a Soveraignty placed in it ſelf, and to be made Judge of its Judges, and reluctſ againſt nothing ſo much as a captivating of the Underſtanding.

§. 13.

But indeed the effects of ſuch yoke thrown off, and of ſuch a Liberty eſtabliſhed in ſtead thereof, ſeem to be very ſad. For, beſides * the Sin of Diſobedience to thoſe our Lord Chriſt hath ſet over us, (if indeed they be ſuch Spiritual Guides to whom we owe Submiſſion of Judgment); * the heavineſs of the Church's Cenſures and Anathemas, (if theſe ſhould be juſtly incurred by us); * the liability of the more illiterate and ignorant ſort of Chriſtians (which are the moſt) of falling into farr more and more groſs and fundamental errours, than can poſſibly come from Obedience and Submiſſion to the Church-Governours, though ſuppoſed alſo fallible; and * the great ſins both in a Chriſtian's Practice and in the Divine Service, which ſuch errours may bring along with them; || Beſides a continual unſettledneſs in a be-

lief that is founded on our own judgment; very mutable, as things are differently represented to it; and hastily resolving many times only because seeing few doubts; and, not because there are not, but because we perceive not, the difficulties; Besides the solicitude and jealousy, that such persons ought to have, concerning their not having sufficiently studied the grounds of their Faith, or used a competent diligence to inform themselves of the truth, (without which they may still miss of it): Besides all these, I say; it happens, that several judgments reading the Scripture, and understanding it in a several way, all assured of its Clearness in Necessaries, and confident of their own Sincerity (which they cannot be of another's), hence Sects *and variety of Opinions (according to men's different capacities) become infinitely multiplied; Hence Censuring also and vilifying of their Spiritual Superiours, whose* errours *they think they clearly discover,* ——(which Spiritual Pride, and conceitedness in Religion, and Contradiction to Superiours, saith *Dr Sh.* || are to be reckoned among the worst Symptomes of a declining Church): *Hence also in such diversity of opinion happens an alienation of* Affections; *and so, very great Divisions and Factions. As we see, that those* Sects *departed from the Church of* England *no way agree amongst themselves; and when any of them, by their extraordinary increase, gets any power and dominion over the rest, there presently follows a proportionable endeavour to advance and propagate it self and root out the other: because they would have all men of the very best Religion, that is,* their own.

|| *Serm. on Act.* 24. 14.

§. 14. *And it seems a great Inadvertency in those, who are now marshalling up all their Arguments and Forces against an unlimited Church-Authority, and against the Usurpers of an unjust Ecclesiastical Power, and Exactours of an undue submission and Obedience, to take so little notice of those other more dangerous enemies, who are marching up in the reare of them, under pretence of being their Auxiliaries in this warr: Whenas they have great cause to fear (so soon as any Opportunity may be offered) their making use of those Armes, I mean Arguments and Principles, wherewith they now furnish them, for attempting the demolishing also of that Church-Authority, the first Reformation hath as yet left standing: To which, though hitherto by them unsuccesfully assaulted, yet they no way appear reconciled.*

§. 15. *Neither in this Division of Opinions, naturally flowing from such a Principle, and, as Experience hath shewed, very mischievous in its effect, doth there appear any possibility of the reducing such a mixt and heterogeneous Body to a firm* Union *and* Peace; *where is no* Judge *to end their differences, but only that, whose Language, misunder-*

stood

ſtood, cauſeth them; I mean, the Scriptures. *Which laſt Conſideration was one of Mr.* Chillingworth's Motives *for reconciling himſelf to the* Roman-Catholick *Religion*——Becauſe (*ſaith he* ||) by denying all humane authority, either of Pope, or Councils, or Church, to determine Controverſies of Faith, they have aboliſhed all poſſible means of ſuppreſſing Hereſy, or reſtoring Unity to the Church. || *Motive* 10 *Pref.* §.42.

To Which, at his return to Proteſtantiſme, *for the ſatisfying himſelf and others, (if any have the curioſity to know it) be deviſed this Anſwer.* §. 16. 1. 1ſt, *for the means of ſuppreſſing* Hereſy——That all men ſhould believe the Scripture [*i.e. is to be Gods Word*] and endeavour to believe it in the true ſenſe: for that ſo none ſuch can poſſibly be an Heretick: ſaith he. *But here, firſt, how ſhall any aſſure himſelf of having uſed a right endeavour? Next, of thoſe who do not ſo endeavour ſome may be Hereticks; and, if Hereticks, ought to be ſuppreſſed; and cannot be ſuppreſſed without ſome Judge of their non-endeavours, and of their Hereſy, beſides themſelves; and ſuch Judge is the thing this man would decline. Laſtly, If God hath appointed ſome ſpiritual Guides for directing people in the belief of Scripture in its true ſenſe, a right endeavour cannot be uſed herein, without repairing to, and learning it from, them; the dependence on whom, for not incurring Hereſy, this Author would avoid.* 2ly. *For preſerving* Unity *in the Church, That there be a Comprehenſion of all Sects and Opinions within the pale of one Communion*||——That (*ſaith he*) no more be required of any man to make him capable of the Church's Communion than this, that every one endeavour to believe Scripture in its true ſenſe. *So he. Now, this men may equally do, in their believing it in a moſt contrary ſenſe, according to their different capacities; and the agreement that thus can be among them will be only tolerating all diſagreements. Of which ſee more in the following Diſcourſe* §.96. 2. || *Pref.* §.43

I meet alſo with another Engliſh Divine, who, in his Satisfaction concerning True Religion, *conjecturing the cauſes of the late great increaſe of Popery in* England, *pitcheth upon this very ſame thing, that induced* Chillingworth *to Popery*——Nothing (*ſaith he*||) among us (except ignorance and wickedneſs) increaſeth Popery more than the ſcandal of our numerous and ſome of them abominable Sects, when the people ſee many zealous Profeſſours turne *Quakers*, or *Ranters*, or *Seekers*, or *Antinomians*, or *Socinians*, or *Familiſts*; and ſhall See the more tolerable parties (*Epiſcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, Eraſtian, Separatiſts* and *Anabaptiſts*) condemning backbiting reproching making odious (if not perſecuting) one another, and ſhunning many of them the Communi- §. 17. || *p.*178.

on

on of one another as they do the *Papists*, This makes them think that they must seek some surer, soberer way, than any of us have yet found. *This cause of the increase of* Popery *he truly discerned*, viz. *the continual increase of Sects in all Parties, save Popery*; *and for this, Men, that dread the hazards of the next world more than this, flee apace into the Catholick Church, there to find an* unity *of* Faith, *and be at some* certainty *and* rest. *But, how shall the cause of the* increase *of* Popery *be removed? Or, how can such a* Principle *in a Church, as the fore-mentioned, proceed to any cure of it? Of one sort of these Sectarists divided from the Bishops he himself is*; *How can he deny to others the liberty he takes? Or must he not come at last only to Mr* Chillingworths *device*; *where is no Judge,* [1] *an universal* Toleration *of all good Endeavourers to understand Scripture*; *and* [2] *an* Internal Communion *of* Charity (*for, an External, the Rites of which may please, or at least may continue to please all parties, can never be invented*; *nothing being more controverted than concerning the Celebration, Ceremonies, Vertue,* &c, *of the* Sacraments); *But it seems by him, neither will those be attained where is such diversity of Opinions: but,* (*to repeat his words*)——There will be condemning, backbiting, reproching, making odious (if not persecuting) one another, and shunning many of them the Communion of one another, as they do the Papists. [*I add, from Experience; And suppressing and crushing one another, as any of them gets power.*]

§. 18. *These then are the Ways, that the Patrons of* Christians Liberty *usually take for its defence*; *and these seem the Effects of it, where allowed*: *whilst the Contenders for* Obedience *and Submission of Judgment to our Spiritual Superiours and Guides take quite the contrary Course. They endeavour to plant in all their Subjects the greatest reverence and esteem of the* Lords Clergy, *and Ministers, of their learning, wisdome, piety, and the assistence of Gods Holy Spirit preserving them for ever, at* least *in their highest Courts of Judicature, in all Necessary truth. They maintain a strict* Subordination *in the Church's* Hierarchy, *and an Unity of Government in the Catholick Church, though spread thorow never so many several temporal Dominions: all subjected to one Supreme Court and President thereof*; *and to the same* Definitions *and* Laws, *as to matters purely Spiritual*; *and these no way alterable by Civil States. They urge the great* Heresies *in the highest points of Faith, that the sharpest Wits in former times have fallen into by departing from the sense of the Church. The greater men's parts are, they being more prone, when swayed by Interest, or passionately addicted to a party, to embrace and believe the*

most

most absurd opinions; because they can discover, and are furnished with, more plausible arguments, and Verisimilities, to maintain them. They *press the necessity of an* Unity *both in Faith, and Communion; and, of the latter its including also the first; a varying of* faith *varying also the publick* Divine Worship *and Service. They defend and urge a necessity also of the Church's many Definitions in the Faith from time to time as any dangerous opinions invade it; and so, the Faith also by the Divine Providence is continually made more distinct clear and illustrious; and the Adherents to it more united, from such oppositions; and they maintain the Authority of the Church in all ages the same, and equall, and equally assisted from Heaven to crush the one, and defend the other; else, that the giving way to diversity of Opinions would at last leave no Fundamental of the Christian Faith unshaken, and unquestioned;* Atheism *stealing in by certain degrees from indulging too great a* latitude *in the Faith.* They *press the Scriptures that recommend* Humility, captivating *the* Intellect, *not being* wise *in our own conceit, and that command in all things Obedience*——that they should all *say one thing,* and that there should *be no Schismes among them*; but that they should be *perfect in one sense, and one knowledg.*——That they should *continue in the same Canon or Rule.* And——*Mark those that make dissensions and scandals contrary to the doctrines which they had learned, and avoid them. Which precepts cannot be observed, unless there be in the Church some Persons, whose judgment, doctrine, faith, spirit, all the rest are to follow and conform to.*

Rom. 12.16. *2 Cor.* 2.9. *Heb.* 13.7, 17. --1 *Cor.* 1.10.--*Rom.* 16.17.-*Phi.* 3.16.

§. 19.

The effects *also of which Obedience to those Guides seem to be quite* different *from those former ones of Liberty; and as happy, as the other unfortunate: Great unanimity peace and concord in the Members of such a Church; where, instead of continual* consultations *concerning his* Religion, *and that made by every laick from Generation to generation, without any settlement in those matters, the consideration of which belongs to the Councils of the Church, is a stable Union in Faith and Doctrine, with such a well grounded confidence of these Guides their not erring herein, as there remains no expectation of having something amended, nor fears of having it altered. Where the main business is to believe and practise, as these teach him; and a great readiness to part with any opinion which may perhaps be different, so soon as the Church is known by him to teach the contrary; And, in any storm that happens to arise in the Church and divide these Governours, He suffers no distraction to whom to pay this his obedience; in any opposition of Inferiours giving it always to the* Superiour *Ecclesiastical, Persons, or Councils: Again, in any Controversy concerning the* judgment *or sentiment of Antiquity, or former Church, acquiescing*

in the Sentence of the present; whose authority he esteems no whit inferiour to that of past Ages; and both to be guided by the same Holy Spirit.

§. 20. *Thus the* humble *Christian, by an happy* resignation *of his* Judgment *where our Lord seems to him to demand it, enjoyes a perpetual peace and rest from dispute, together with all his fellow-members of the same Body, as to all those matters of greater moment, wherein these his Spiritual Superiours have published their judgment; with much less trouble to himself, and more truth; not by studying the Controversies, but assenting to the Church's Decisions of them; and so remaining safe in his Faith without being Learned. And lastly, this* Unity *of* Faith *and Doctrine in such a resolved Obedience is accompanied also with a much firmer league & union of* Charity (*the latter being hardly to be attained, or long continued, without the former*); *and with a blessed Uniformity also of God's Publick Service and Worship and of the External Communion of the members of such a Church entirely the same in all Nations, (though no one Society & Communion of Christians is so universally extended and diffused as it). In which,* Communion *and* Worship, *the* Faith, *being once changed, presently makes some alterations, (as it did in* Luther's *days): and none can continue long together in their* Communion, *who are divided in their* Faith. *By all these effects the security of such an* Obedience *seems much preferrable to the perpetual instability of private men's* liberty; *and the plea for it much more preservative of* Church-Authority, *the Authentick Conservator and Expositor of Holy* Scripture; *and more becoming a Clergy-man. But, as it seems much more to be desired, so, whether it be also sufficiently maintained, I leave to the equal Reader's judgment in the perusal of the following Concertations: from which therefore I shall no longer detaine him.* Domine, illumina tenebras nostras.

THE

THE CONTENTS OF THE DISCOURSE.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Points Neceſſary: and a Right Underſtanding of the Scriptures in them.

A *Pre-Conceſſion.* [1] *That the Holy Scriptures contain all points generally neceſſary for attaining Salvation;* and [2] *That ſome of theſe Neceſſaries are clear therein to all or moſt Capacities.*

1. Propoſition. *That either a Writing, ſo clearly delivering all points neceſſary as that no ſober Enquirer can err in them: Or, an Infallible Directer, where ſuch Writing is not to all, in all ſuch points, clear, well conſiſts with the Wiſdome and Goodneſs of God in manifeſting his Will to Men.* §. 1.

2. *That the Clearneſs of the Scripture affirmed in Neceſſaries to Salvation cannot rationally be reſtrained only to the points expreſly mentioned in the Apoſtle's or other ancient Creeds, or to thoſe only, wherein all Chriſtian Churches are agreed.* §. 2.

Where, *That believing the Ancient Creeds, and Leading a Good Life (abſtracting from one duty of it, viz. yielding a due Obedience to our Spiritual Superiours) is not ſufficient for attaining Salvation.* §. 3.

3. *That a Controverſy, ſuppoſed in a neceſſary matter of Faith, cannot be decided, when two contrary parties plead Clearneſs of Scripture on their own ſide, without ſome other Judge beſide the Scriptures.* §. 4.

As the Controverſy concerning the Senſe of the Text, Hoc eſt Corpus meum. §. 5. Where,

That such Answers as these, maintaining the contrary, seem defective and unsatisfactory: viz.

* *That there is no necessity, that some Controversies in matters of Religion be decided.* §. 7.

Or * *That there are other Means of attaining the certain Sense of Scripture* [*i.e. in some things*] *without such a Judge.* [*For, the Question is made, When, after the using all such means; or, When to Persons whose condition permits not to use such means, the Sense of Scriptures remains still doubtful; as to many such it doth*] §. 8.

* *Or, That the Sense of Scripture may be certainly learnt from the Determinations of Ancient Councils or Unanimous Consent of Fathers.* [*For, as some Controversies in some Necessaries arose and were discussed in the ancient, so may and have some others in latter times: and, since there is Controversy also not unfrequently concerning what hath been, the unanimous Consent of Fathers in particular points, or the results of lawful ancient Councils, there will yet be wanting a present Judge for determining these: and, since the Church of all times, former or latter, hath equal authority, any present modern Determinations seem as authentick and obliging, as the Ancient.*]. §. 9.

4. *That, since the Scriptures are affirmed clear in Necessaries only upon the condition of a sincere endeavour, one, not assured first of this sincere endeavour (yet of which there seems no certain means), cannot be secure of his not erring in Necessaries: For example, the* Socinian. *And this especially, when a major part of Christianity understands the sense of such Scriptures, against him. And the same uncertainty holds of one's having sufficiently used other helps, if these also be required.* §. 11. *Or, if here such a lower degree of endeavour be affirmed only necessary and required, as suits with Christians of the meanest emplements and capacities, that such endeavour seems not sufficient for understanding all necessary points. Or, if it be, that by such an Endeavour, the Church-Governours may as well be presumed not to err in points necessary; and so the other people may safely acquiesce in their Judgment.* §. 12.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning a Neceſſity of Church-Guides for inſtructing of Chriſtians in Points Neceſſary.

THat the Clearneſs of Scripture in all neceſſaries upon a right endeavour to underſtand them, if meant without the help of the Church-Guides, *renders their inſtructing of the people, as to theſe points, not neceſſary: But, if underſtood* with the uſe of their help, *implies the Scriptures in ſuch points not clear without their Expoſition: and inferrs a neceſſity of the not erring of ſuch Guides in theſe points, that the people by them may be rightly directed.* §. 13.

Where, *That ſuch Anſwers as theſe in this matter ſeem not pertinent.* * *That a manifold neceſſity of Church-Authority is ſtill maintained* [*i.e. as to other arts of it, not this*]: * *That theſe Church-Guides are of great uſe alſo for inſtructing unskilful perſons in Scripture doubtful and obſcure*; [*but not ſaid to be obſcure and doubtful in neceſſaries; which would overthrow the Suppoſition, that they are herein clear.*] §. 14.

CHAP. III.

Concerning Obedience and Submiſſion of Judgment due from the Church's Subjects to their Governours in Divine matters: and, in theſe, the more, the more they are neceſſary.

1. THat the Church's Subjects have an obligation of Obedience and Submiſſion of Judgment to their Eccleſiaſtical Superiours; *and this as to points neceſſary.* §. 19.

Proved by Scriptures. *Where the Texts* Deut. 17. 8.——*and* 2. Chron. 19. 6. *are vindicated from Dr* St's *Exceptions,* §. 22. *And his other Objections of the erring of the Higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Courts under Moſes's Law, in* Ration. Account *p.* 241. *anſwered.* §. 25.

2. *That ſuch Obedience and Submiſſion of Judgment, if granted due to theſe Governours, is, in any Diviſion of them, to be yielded to the Superiour, Perſons, or Councils.* §. 26.

Where, *Dr* St's *Pleas in behalf of the Church of* England, *in order to this, are conſidered.* Viz.

* *That there was no obliging authority extant at the Reformation, Superiour to that of this Church.* §. 27. 32.

* *That It was, then, free from the Authority of the* Pope *and Church of* Rome. §. 29.

* *That It ſubmitteth to, or conſenteth with, the Church Primitive and Apoſtolical; or, the truly Catholick Church of all Ages.* §. 31.

* *That It hath not been ſo guilty of violating the Church-Canons, as that of* Rome. §. 33.

* *That Particular Churches may reform abuſes and errours within themſelves, when a more General Conſent cannot be obtained:* [*But not, therefore, when a more general Diſſent is formerly declared*]. §. 34.

3. *That Learned Proteſtants grant a Submiſſion of Judgment due to Church-Authority from all ſuch Perſons, as have no demonſtrable Certainty that It commands them any thing contrary to God's Word.* §. 35.

4. *That, ſetting aſide any duty of Obedience, the pleleian and unlearned ought, for the underſtanding of Scriptures, to acquieſce in the judgment of thoſe more skilful and ſtudied in them, without diſtinguiſhing thoſe Neceſſaries wherein is ſuppoſed any difference in mens Judgments.* §. 37. *And that, what is to them uſing a due induſtry clear in Scriptures, may be preſumed will be ſo to their Guides. Ibid.*

Where, *The Anſwer; That Chriſtians cannot be ſecure, that their Guides, though they do not miſtake in neceſſary matters of Faith, yet do not miſ-teach others in them; and the transferring Infallibility thus from the Uſual Notion, of theſe Guides their not erring or being deceived in theſe matters, to an Infallibility of their not deceiving others, ſeems very unſatisfactory.* §. 38.

5. *That to whatever liability to miſtakes and errours the Church-Guides are ſubject, yet there is leſs hazard to the Vulgar in adhering to their's, than to their own opinions.*

Where, *Such Exceptions and Anſwers as theſe that follow againſt the former Obedience aſſerted in this Chapter, ſeem not ſolid and pertinent.* Viz:

* *That God hath entruſted every man with a Faculty of Diſcerning Truth and Falſhood:* [*But this, rightly uſed, will diſcern this truth, that ſubmiſſion of judgment is due*

to

to our Spiritual Superiours]. §. 40.

* *That Guides tranſgreſſing their Rule are not to be followed.* [*True; when theſe Guides are certainly and demonſtrably known to any to do ſo: but, who ſhall judge of ſuch certainty? and, were any ſo certain, or rather conceited that they are ſo, yet all the reſt will remain ſtill obliged to Obedience.*].

* *That the concurrent Senſe of Antiquity is an excellent Means to underſtand the minde of Scripture in places, otherwiſe doubtful and obſcure.* [*But, here, not a Means which may be beneficially uſed, but a Superiour, that muſt be obeyed and ſubmitted-to, is demanded for ending Controverſies.*]. §. 44.

* *That no abſolute ſubmiſſion can be due to two Church-Authorities contradicting one another:* [*But it is denied, that the Supreme have done ſo: and, in thoſe Subordinate contradicting, ſubmiſſion is due to the Superiours*]. §. 46.

* *That, in the preſent divided ſtate of the Church, a man muſt make uſe of his judgment in the choice of his Church.* [*But this judgment, rightly uſed, ſhews obedience and ſubjection due, in any diviſion, to the Superiour, Perſons, or Councils, as the Communion we ought to live in and make choice of.*]. §. 47.

* *That we may not ſubmit to all thoſe who challenge the authority of Guides; nor to lawful Guides in all things they may require.* [*Which as thus ſpoken in general, ſo will be willingly granted*].

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Infallibility of theſe Governours in Neceſſaries.

THat the Church is infallible as to Neceſſaries in her Lawfull General Councils. §. 49.

Proved * *by the Practice of ſuch Councils, accepted and ſubmitted to by the Church Catholick diffuſive* §. 50.

* *From the Neceſſity thereof for the preſerving the ſtability and certainty of the Chriſtian Faith.* §. 51.

* *From*

* *From the Promiſes in Scripture* §. 52. Where, *That Dr* St. *holds the* Roman *Church hitherto never to have erred in Neceſſaries.* §. 53.

* *From the Teſtimony, of S.* Auſtin *in his proceedings againſt the Donatiſts.* §. 54. *And, of the* Greek *Church.* §. 56.

* *From Archbiſhop* Lawd's, *and, ſometimes, Dr* St's, *holding the Catholick Church, not only in its Being, but as to its Teaching and Determinations, Infallible.* §. 57.

Dr St's *Replies conſidered* * *Concerning the Practice of Councils.* §. 64. &c. * *Concerning the Certainty of the Chriſtian Faith without Infallible Church-Governours.* §. 63. * *Concerning S.* Auſtin. §. 71. * *That the Argument from the Evidence of our Senſes, urged by Dr* St. *and others, diſproves not the Infallibility of the* Roman-Catholick *Church.*

CHAP. V.

No Supreſſing of Sects and Hereſies without admitting an Eccleſiaſtical Judge.

That all Sects, for their Tenents, equally appeal to the Clearneſs of the Scripture. §. 81.

That the leaving all men, for knowing Neceſſaries, to the clearneſs of Scripture therein, without requiring their ſubmiſſion to the Judgment of the Church, can afford no effectual remedy of Hereſies and Schiſmes. §. 83.

That the Conſtitutions of the Church of England *ſeem contrary to this; and to require Submiſſion of Judgment.* §. 84.

Dr St's *Replies, contending, that his* Principles *no way juſtify Sects, conſidered.* §. 86. viz.:

* *That there is a great difference between the Church of* England's *ſeparation from* Rome, *and that of the Sects from* Her. §. 87.

* *That no Infallibility is challenged by her in reſpect of her Subjects, as is by* Rome. §. 89. * *That her Doctrines are not made neceſſary to ſalvation, nor any excluded from it, meerly becauſe not being in her Communion.* §. 90. *Nor any immediate authority challenged*

lenged by her of obliging the Conſciences of Men. §. 91. Where;

That, though none of theſe things could be charged on her by the Sects *that have left her, as they are by* Her *on the Church of* Rome *left by Her, yet ſtill by her example, as alſo by theſe Tenents of hers, the* Sects *(though agreeing with her in theſe may think themſelves at liberty to depart from her for other things, wherein to them ſhe ſeems faulty or defective; as She, for this cauſe, did depart from her Superiours.*

His Replies, contending, that his Principles afford a juſt and ſufficient Means of remedying Sects, conſidered §. 93.

Where: *That the Recommending of Humility, Obedience, and a due Submiſſion to our Spiritual Paſtors, and the not uſurping of their Office,* &c *underſtood excluſively, to ſubmiſſion of private mens judgment to them, and to reſtraint of Liberty of Opinion, or of contradiction as to any of the Church's Definitions and Doctrines in matters of Faith, are no ſufficient means of ſuppreſſing Hereſies and Sects. Yet, That, if Proteſtants would only admit this latter of not contradicting, there could have been, or can be, no Reformations at any time againſt any ſuch Doctrines of the former Church.* §. 94.

And, That the Church's Authority, of making Rules and Canons; of Reforming any abuſes in Practice, or errours in Doctrine; of inflicting Cenſures upon Offenders; of Receiving into, and Excluding out of the Church ſuch perſons which according to the laws of a Chriſtian Society are to be taken in, or ſhut out, &c. *if not extending to Excluding Diſſenters from her Doctrines and Definitions in matters of Faith, is ſtill deficient, as to the ſame purpoſe.* §. 100. &c.

Concerning the Conſent ſaid to be required from all her Clergy by the Church of England *to her Articles of Religion.* §. 104.

Mr Chillingworths *Propoſal in this matter for procuring a general Unity in Communion and Peace in the Church, conſidered.* §. 96.

The vanity and uneffectiveneſs of it as to the End aimed at. §. 97.

A Table of the Principall CONTENTS of the *ANNOTATIONS.*

THat Tradition qualified with the other Motives is a ſufficiently certain Evidence, Of the Infallibility of the Church, as Divinely aſſiſted; Or, Of the Canon of Scripture; Or, Of any other Divine Revelations, teſtified by it to be ſuch. p. 85, 94. 97.

That either Infallibility of the Church, or of Scriptures, may be the firſt thing believed from Tradition. And either of theſe proved from the other, as either is firſt known. p. 123, 133, 169.

The expreſſion of a Moral Infallibility vindicated. p. 94. *And, that, as Moral Infallibility is applied to Tradition, ſo, not to Church-Infallibility, as Divinely aſſiſted. Ib.*

That an Aſſent built only on a morally-infallible Evidence never comes to be more than morally infallible. Or, that an Aſſent never riſeth higher than the Evidence. p. 96.

The ſeveral ways, How, in a Divine Faith, an Infallible Aſſent is ſaid to be yielded to Divine Revelation. p. 87.

On what account Church-Infallibility neceſſary, notwithſtanding the Certainty and ſelf-evidence of Tradition. And, that Chriſtians, without this Church-Infallibility, are no way certain or ſecure, as to ſeveral neceſſary points of their Faith, becauſe not ſo clearly delivered or manifeſted, as to all perſons, by Tradition. p. 89, 93, 97, 98, 125.

That all Neceſſary Points of Faith are not clear in Scripture to all capacities without the aſſiſtance of their Guides. p. 98. 170.

The Text 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. *conſidered.* p. 173.

The Teſtimony of S.* Auſtin De Doctrina Chriſtiana, *l.* 2. *c.* 9. p. 195. *And * of S.* Chryſoſtome in 2 Theſs. Hom. 3. *concerning Clearneſs of Scripture, conſidered.* p. 233.

That ſeveral other Means of underſtanding Scripture void not the Directions and Deciſions herein of Church-Guides, where either the other means cannot be uſed by Secular Perſons

of manual emploiments; or, used, leave the ſenſe of Scripture ſtill ambiguous to meaner Capacities. And, that, the more certain ſuch other means are, the more they aſſure us of the Church-Guides their not erring herein. p. 179.

That the Canons of Councils do clearlier decide ſome neceſſary points controverted, than the Text of Scripture; and ſo effect a greater union of Doctrine in a Society ſubmitting to them, than is among thoſe ſubmitting only to Scripture. p. 133.

That Poſitive Laws, beſides the Law of Nature, were from the Beginning in Gods Church; and the Church-Guides, then, as to neceſſaries infallible. p. 91, 124.

That, under Moſes's *Law the people were enjoined Submiſſion of Judgment to the Deciſions of an Eccleſiaſtical Judge.* p. 113.

That from Private Men's (when uſing a right endeavour) the Argument holds to the Church-Guides, (if uſing the like) their not erring or being deceived in Neceſſaries: but is not extended ſo far as that therefore they are infallible in another ſenſe alſo, viz: *ſo, as that they cannot deceive others, in mis-teaching them in Neceſſaries.* p. 136.

That the Exerciſe of private men's judgments in all things is allowed: but its erring, or the non-ſubmittance of it to another, where due, not therefore excuſed. And, that the charging Chriſtians to beware of falſe Prophets, ſeducers, falſe Guides &c. ſtill fixeth them more cloſely to the true. p. 138.

That Perſons, conſulting their Guides concerning the Senſe of the Rule, cannot judge of their Judgment, whether right, by the Rule; concerning the ſenſe whereof they conſulted them: i.e. *they cannot learn the ſenſe of the Rule from their Guides, and then know the truth of their ſentence, from the Rule.* p. 140.

How, or by what Marks, the true Church is to be diſcerned from Sects: from which Church firſt known the Enquirer may learn the true Faith. p. 106. 152. 155. 209. *And that, In any differenee or contrariety of Church-Governours, the Superiour Authority is to be obeyed.*

That Chriſtians both prudently may, and in Duty ought, to ſubject their Judgment in Divine matters to Church-Authority, though ſuppoſed fallible; whereever they are not certain of the contrary to its Deciſions. p. 99, 223.

That all other Magiſtrates and Superiours are deficient and come ſhort, as to one branch of Authority belonging to the Church; viz. *the Deciding of what is Truth and errour, Lawful and Unlawful in Divine Matters: for which Infallibility is neceſſary*

ceſſary to them, when not ſo to the others. p. 222.

That Church-Infallibility is clearly enough evidenced to Chriſtians, both from the Scriptures; and from Tradition p. 109. And that Catholicks place this Infallibility in a lawful General Council. p. 96

Where: Concerning the Decrees of General Councils their being put in the Creeds. And an Univerſal Aſſent required to them under Anathema p. 127.

Concerning the Anathemas paſſed by inferiour and fallible Councils p. 127, 129.

Some Quotations out of Dr Field: and the Text Gal. 1. 8. conſidered p. 130, 131.

That Dr Field clearly maintains, ſome Viſible Church or other conſiſting of Prelates and Subjects, and giving Laws, to be infallible as to Neceſſaries in all Ages: which Church the unlearned at leaſt are adviſed by him to ſearch out; and ſo to follow her Directions and reſt in her Judgment. p. 103.

The Deficiencies in his Tenent. p. 105.

That Miracles are not neceſſary in all Ages to atteſt the Church's Infallibility. p. 116.

That true Miracles for many good ends, advancing the Glory of God and the Catholick Faith, have been continued in the Catholick Church (but not ſo elſewhere) ever ſince the Apoſtles times. p. Ibid.

How Miracles ſignify the Infallibility of thoſe, by whom God worketh them. p. 118.

The Latter Times of the Church doing Miracles in all the ſame kinds, as the Former: and both, as our Lord and his Apoſtles did. p. 119.

Several Controverſies in Religion neceſſary to be decided; and thoſe, reſpecting Manners, as well as Faith. p. 175. &c.

By what Authority General Councils aſſemble, and decide Controverſies. p. 174.

In what manner General Councils and the Church-Guides are an Infallible ſtanding Judge of Controverſies. p. 132, 238.

Lawful General Councils of any Age ſince the Apoſtles times of equal Authority, and Obligation. p. 151, 160, 205.

That we want a Judge for the neceſſary Deciſion of many Con-

Controverſies : *As, for inſtance, Whether Latter Times have altered what Chriſt or his Apoſtles delivered? or, Have impoſed things contrary to the plain Commands of Scripture? Or, Latter lawful General Councils contradicted former? or, What former Councils are to be accounted General, Legal, and Obligatory? Whether, what is pretended to be the concordant ſenſe of Antiquity, or to be contrary to it, really is ſo? Whether ſome things repugnant to Gods Word are not commanded by our Superiours as things Indifferent?* &c. *I ſay, that the Chriſtian World is deſtitute of a Judge to end ſuch differences, unleſs the Preſent Church be It; and is, in ſuch Conteſts, to be appealed and ſtood to.* p. 140. 141.

That the preſent unanimous Agreement of the Apoſtolical Churches, and eſpecially the conſent of the Prime Apoſtolick See joined with them, was by the Ancients eſteemed and urged as Infallible; and to which all owed Submiſſion of Judgment p. 180, 181.

Held ſo by thoſe Ancient Writers cited by Dr St.

By S. Irenæus *p.* 182. *By* Tertullian *p.* 185.
By Clemens Alexandrinus. *p.* 188. *By S.* Athanaſius. *p.* 190. 203.
By S. Auſtin. *p.* 194, 206 *By* Vincentius Lerinenſis *p.* 197.
The place, * *in S.* Gregory Nazianzen *Ep.* 55. *concerning Councils, conſidered p.* 194.
* *In S.* Auſtin, *Contra Maximin. l.* 3. *c.* 14. *p.* 194. *De Unitate Eccl. c.* 19. *p.* 212. *De Baptiſmo. l.*2. *c.*3. *p.* 217.

Arguments uſed by the Fathers againſt Heretick both from infallible Church-Tradition, and from the Scriptures; and that thoſe from the latter, notwithſtanding the evidence of the former, are neceſſary againſt perſons not ſubmitting to the other. p. 190, 191.

The Places out of Petavius *and S.* Hierome *concerning the Tradition of the Doctrine of the Trinity before the Council of* Nice, *conſidered. p.* 201. &c.

Unanimous Conſent of the Fathers, Primitive Times, Catholick Church in her Councils, in order to Our Obedience, how to be underſtood. 159, 200. *And* Vincentius Lerinenſis *his Rule*——Quod ubique, quod ſemper, *&c. Ibid; not neceſſarily comprehending all particular Perſons or Churches.*

Univerſality (*underſtood of the Catholick Church diſtinct from Heretical*) *never, as to Neceſſaries, diſſenting from Antiquity. p.* 199.

How

How the believing of the Determinations of General Councils is neceſſary to ſalvation. p. 164.

That Heretical and Schiſmatical Churches are no Members of the Catholick. p. 154.

That a Church committing and teaching Idolatry is no true Member of the Catholick Church. p. 80. &c.

The Nicene *Council to be obeyed, ſuppoſe the* Arian *Councils more numerous as to the Biſhops preſent in them; becauſe the* Nicene *more univerſally accepted; and the* Arian, *how numerous ſoever, formerly declared Hereticks. p.* 146. 193.

Of Pope Liberius *and* Honorius, *accuſed of Hereſy. p.* 146. 149.

That no Certainty from Senſe or Reaſon can rationally be pleaded for any Doctrine againſt a General Council, or Major part of Chriſtianity, having all the ſame means of Certainty from Reaſon and Senſe, and they maintaining the contrary Doctrine certain. p. 143, 145.

Where: *Concerning Veneration of Images. Communicating in One Kind. p.* 144.

That our Senſes are not to be credited, where is the certainty of a Divine Revelation contrary. Nor doth the Diſbelieving them in ſuch things prejudice the Certainty of their Evidence as to all other matters, where no Divine Revelation oppoſeth. p. 142. &c.

No Reformation lawful againſt the Definitions of a Superiour Church-Authority. p. 236.

In a Controverſy, Whether a National Church hath departed from the truly Catholick Church of former Ages, who is to be the Judge. p. 237.

That National Churches and Councils are ſubject to Patriarchal and Generall. p. 152. 226.

That any particular Church may require Aſſent from all her Subjects to her Doctrines of Religion, ſo far as ſuch Church accords therein with the Church Catholick. Becauſe, in theſe ſhe infallible, if the Catholick be ſo. p. 222.

Whether a fallible Church may require aſſent to her doctrines, or to ſome of them at leaſt, as to matter of Faith; where ſhe, as fallible, confeſſeth ſhe may err in ſuch matters? Or, ſhe not requiring ſuch ſubmiſſion to them as to matters of fauh, Whether her Subjects are not left to their liberty to believe in ſuch matters what ſeems to them trueſt? p. 228, 230.

Whether

Whether a Church fallible can juſtly require of all her Clergy *the aſſenting to, and maintaining of, all her Articles of Religion? And then, How Errours can be rectified in ſuch a Church where all the Clergy ſtand obliged to teach nothing contrary to the publick doctrines thereof? And, 2ly. Whether, if this be juſtly done by the Church of* England, *it be not ſo by the* Roman, *and by Councils, as to the Clergy ſubject to them? p.* 228.

Whether the Church of England *doth not require Aſſent from all her Subjects to her Articles of Religion? Or, leaves all men at leaſt, ſaving the Clergy, to their liberty of opinion. p.* 82. 227.

Whether a Superiour Authority was not oppoſed by the Church of England *in the Reformation? p.* 235. 238.

How the Principles of ſome later Engliſh Divines are ſaid to juſtify Sects. p. 157.

That private Men's relying on their own judgment in the Senſe of Scripture (believed clear to any ſober Reader in all Neceſſaries) againſt that of their Eccleſiaſtical Governours occaſions a multiplication of Sects. p. 221. 241.

That the only effectual means in the Catholick Church for preſerving her Communion from Hereſies and Sects is requiring Submiſſion of Judgment from her Subjects to her Definitions in matters of Faith; and removing Diſſenters from her Communion. p. 241. (*Juſtified by the Apoſtolical Practice. p.* 242.)

And, in any particular Church, is its Adhering to, and Union in Faith with, the Catholick.

Of the Inquiſition, *uſed in ſome parts of the* Roman *Church; not uſed in others. p.* 242.

Errata.

Errata.

Pag. 29. line 26. reade *assert.*
p. 39. l. 6. after *us so*; adde *where also we are to believe our senses, that it tells us so.*
p. 53. l. 23. r. *to Scripture.*
p. 59. l. 10. r. *did from.*
p. 73. l. (4) r. *to beare.*
p. 87. l. (6) r. *faith is.* Ib. l. (5) r. *nor without.*
p. 96. l. 20. r. *n.* 3.
p. 105. l. 8. r. *sorry.*
p. 163. l. (8) r. praxi.
p. 164. l. 24. r. *Patron.*
p. 183. l. (6) r. *thither from.*
p. 207. l. (6) Salvator.
p. 258. l. 12. r. *till that.*

Contents. p. 3. l. 13. r. *parts of.*

Church-Guides

CHURCH-GUIDES

Neceſſary for Directing Chriſtians in Neceſſary Faith.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Points neceſſary, and a right underſtanding of the Scriptures in them.

§. 1.

AFter *N.O.* In his *Conſiderations*, hath conceded to Dr. *Stillingfleet*. 1. That the Holy Scriptures do contain all points of faith that are *neceſſary* to be of *all* perſons believed for attaining *Salvation*: 2. And again, That in *ſeveral* neceſſaries the *Scriptures* alſo are ſo *clear*, that a very mean underſtanding, in his reading them, needs no further Inſtructer therin; Yet He there denies ſuch an univerſal clearneſs of them in *all* neceſſary matters of faith, as that they may be underſtood by *all* perſons who *ſincerely endeavour* to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their ſalvation. And, whereas the Dr ſaith ‖ *--That it is repugnant to the nature of the deſign & the wiſdom & goodneſs of God to give an infallible aſſurance to perſons in writing his will for the benefit of mankind, if thoſe writings may not be underſtood by all perſons ſincerely endeavouring to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their ſalvation*: N. O. there anſwers, that this may as well conſiſt with the *Deſign* and the *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs* of God, if, in thoſe things wherin theſe Divine Writings are *clear* only to *ſome* perſons, more verſed in the Scriptures and in the Church's *Traditional* Senſe of them, and more aſſiſted from *above* according to their *Miſſion* and Employment, he hath commiſſioned and appointed theſe perſons, continued in a perpetual Succeſſion, to guide and inſtruct the reſt of Chriſtians (many of whom are of a mean *Capacity* and no *learning*);

See Conſid. p. 22.

‖ *Prim. p. 13*

Conſid. p. 13

ing); and hath appointed these others also to learn of them the *true sense* of those places or points of Gods *written Will* wherin to these it happens to be obscure: As also it would, had he left no *Writings* at all, but only *Teachers* to deliver his will perpetually to his Church. Either way, I say, futes well with Gods *Wisdom* & *Goodness*, the writing his Will in all parts of it so *clear*, as none sincerely perusing this writing can have, in any necessaries to his salvation, any doubt. [For this *Will*, if supposed so written, would render any further *Ecclesiastical Guide*, I say not as to many other parts of the Pastorall Office, but yet as to the *expounding* of such *Scriptures*, to such a person, useless.] [a] Or, the leaving a *Standing Ministry* to explicate this his Written Will (the course taken also in giving the *Law* of *Moses*) in any necessary matters, wherin the sense of it is to some disputable and ambiguous. Which of these two God *hath done* is the Question. *N. O.* denies the former, (as the Dr. asserts it): and for his disallowing it gives many *Reasons* and *Evidences*, dispersed here and there in the *Considerations*, as the Doctors *Principles* ministred occasion: which I shall endeavour here to recollect in some better Order; and shall consider, where I find any, his *Replyes*: Reducing the *Considerations*, as relating to those *Principles* forementioned, to these chief Heads or Chapters. 1. Concerning *Points Necessary* and a *right* understanding of the Scriptures in them. 2. Concerning a *Necessity* of *Church-Guides* for instruction of the people in points Necessary. 3. Touching Obedience and *submission* of *Judgment* due from the Church's subjects to the Definitions of these *spirituall Governors*, in Divine matters; and this more in those matters, which are more necessary. 4. Concerning the *Infallibility* of these *Governors* herein. 5. And the Impossibility of suppressing *Sects*, *Heresies*, and *Schisms*, without admitting such an Ecclesiastical *Judge*.

§. 2. 1. First then *N. O.* observes here, that, in the Dr's mentioning *Necessaries* for *Salvation*, *Necessaries* cannot rationally be taken so strictly as to include only those doctrines delivered in Scripture wherin *all* persons that bear the name of Christians do *agree*; for, this would be to say, that whatever is any way *controverted* is *not necessary*; which would conclude all controversies heretofore defined in *General Councils* to be of non-necessaries, even those definitions of theirs put into the common *Creeds*: and so it would become not necessary, if any thing now generally *consented to* shall happen to be *disputed* hereafter. But, that by the same reason as we do not bound necessaries with the *Apostles Creed*, so neither can we with the *latter* common Creeds; I mean, in such a sense as some of the Articles of those *Creeds* are accounted necessa-

ry.

ry. For, some Heresies may arise in latter times as pernicious, as the ancient were; and, as the four *first Councils* lawfully thereupon enlarged the *former Creeds*, so may other Councils in *latter* ages enlarge those of these *first Councils*, to preserve the Church's subjects from any such new corruption of such Creeds. Which *New* Articles, whenever made, *N. O.* contends, that, though these do not become necessary to salvation, so, as if the pure *nescience* of them would condemn any, where is an *invincible* ignorance, or not a *sufficient* proposal; Yet so necessary they may be still, as that the *nescience* of them may be some way or other a considerable *hindrance* to their salvation; and, 2ly. a *resistance* or opposition to them, when known to be declared by the Church, a *Mortal* sin; and so this sin without repentance and amendment exclude from *Salvation*. *Consid.* p. 77

§. 3.

Where *N. O.* also answers that Question, proposed by the Dr. (but also frequently by other Protestants,) *Why the believing of all the ancient Creeds, and leading a good life may not be sufficient to salvation, unless one be of the Communion of the Church of Rome?* That, if he speaks not of the Roman, but Roman-Catholick Church; and means such a good life, as, whilst performing *other duties* belonging to a Christian, yet is defective in the *Obedience* that is due to his spirituall Superiours (for, if *a good life* be so understood as also to include this, the Drs. supposition will be denied, *viz.* that any such person leads a *good* life). Then I say *N. O.* answers: That such believing and leading such a life cannot be sufficient for salvation to so many persons, as either persist, without repentance, in a *wilful* ignorance of their obligation to live in this *Communion*; or, knowing this obligation, persist in a wilful *neglect* to re-unite themselves to it. Because all such persons live in a mortal sin, *viz. disobedience* to, and a *wilful separation* from, their lawful and Canonical Ecclesiastical Superiours, whom our Lord hath set over them: And this sin unrepented of destroys Salvation, being the same that is so heavily condemned by our Saviour, *Si non audieris Ecclesiam*. And again; That we have reason to fear that it is unrepented of, so long as they, having opportunity, either neglect to *reform* their *judgment*; or, this being convinced, to *reform* and rectify their *practice*. And that this seems a judged Case in the *Donatists*, (who pretended some such thing for their security) if we will admit St. *Austin's* sentiment of it: for) thus he directs his speech to them — *Nobiscum estis in Baptismo, in Symbolo, in caeteris Dominici Sacramenti* [and I may safely add, with regard to some of them at least, *You are with us in a good life*, with the former exception], *Spiritum autem unitatis, & vinculo pacis*, *Consid.* p. 78 *Consid.* p. 79

pacis, in ipſâ denique Catholicâ Eccleſiâ nobiſcum non eſtis: And ſo he leaves them to the puniſhment due to thoſe who are out of It, and ſo ſeparated from *Chriſt* its *Head*: That, as to a Chriſtian living in the 5th age of the Church the believing of the *Apoſtles* Creed, (as thoſe of the firſt age did) and leading a good life, would not be ſufficient for ſalvation to ſuch a one, unleſs he continued in the *Communion* of his lawful Eccleſiaſtical Superiours of his own age, when they required from him under *Anathema* or penalty of damnation the belief not only of the Symbol of the *Apoſtles*, but of all the Articles of the *Athanaſian* Creed, (as in the beginning & concluſion of that Creed it is clear they did): So neither will the believing of *thoſe* Creeds, to one living and leading a good life in the preſent age, ſuffice, if he deſerts the Canons and Decrees of his lawful Superiours, requiring, on the ſame penalties, the belief of ſomething more than is expreſſed in theſe Creeds. Again, the Creeds chiefly comprehending *Speculatives*, there muſt be a great Body of *Articles* alſo of neceſſary Faith relating to *Practicals*; all which therefore alſo muſt be maintained by the Dr. to be *clearly* deliver'd in *Scripture*.

The clearneſs of Scriptures then affirmed by him as to all *neceſſaries* muſt be extended to more points than thoſe contained in the Ancient Creeds; Otherwiſe all modern differences between Proteſtants & Roman Catholicks muſt be ſaid to be in unneceſſary matters; wherein yet *Proteſtants* ground all their oppoſition of the Roman Doctrines upon the *clearneſs* of *Scripture* on their ſide; and on the other ſide alſo pretend the greateſt *danger* to be in the *Roman* Communion for her erring in them; as this Dr. in particular, for her *teaching* and *practiſing Idolatry*. In which *point* ſurely, or in none, it is neceſſary that the Holy Scriptures *clearly* guide, and direct Chriſtians.

§. 4. Now, ſince a Clearneſs of Scripture muſt be affirmed by the Dr. in ſome Points *Controverted*, elſe he muſt ſay that no *neceſſary* point can be ſo, a Queſtion will be; How, and, On what ſide, two Parties pretending to it, ſuch *clearneſs* of *Scripture* may be diſcerned? & herein *N. O.* ſees not, how the Dr. can alledge or inſiſt upon ſuch a clearneſs, as to any advantage of the *Proteſtant* Religion. For, ſince not only one, but all Parties pretend a *ſincere endeavour* in the right underſtanding of theſe Scriptures, and, after it, do *differ* ſo much in their *ſenſe*, with what reaſon or charity can the Dr. in thoſe many points debated, (ſurely, ſome, of the *greateſt* Moment,) affirm the ſenſe of theſe Scriptures clear on the Proteſtant ſide, where the *Major part* of *Chriſtendome* underſtands their meaning contrary, as he muſt grant they do in all thoſe he ac-

Conſid. p. 19

counts

counts the common *Errours* both of the *Greek* and *Roman Church* (a large Catalogue of which may be found in many Protestant Authors.)? Or, will he charge all these as defective in a *sincere endeavour*? But rather, such sincere endeavour being indifferently allowed to all Parties, he ought to pronounce the sense of Scripture to be clear, if on any, on that side as the *Major part* doth apprehend it: Which certainly is not the *Protestant*. *Consid.* p. 20

§. 5. For Example. How can the Dr. rationally maintain this Text, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, so often repeated in the Gospels without any *variation* of the *Terms*, to bear a sense clear on the Protestants side; that is, *That the Eucharist is not in a literal or proper sense the Body of Christ*; whenas they are understood in a *literal* sense by much the Major part of the Christian World, not only the *Western*, but *Eastern* Churches also (as Monsieur *Claude* concedes to his worthy Adversary Monsieur *Arnaude*): to which Party also may be added half the Body of Protestants, namely all the *Lutherans*? Now, all these have used their *senses*, and weighed the Arguments drawn from *them*, as well as *Calvinists*. *Claud. in his Last Reply* l. 3. c. 13.

§. 6. But, if the Dr. put this *Text* so much controverted among *Obscure* Scriptures, which therefore not containing any point necessary to *salvation*, salvation is not endangered by it, if a Christian should err or be mistaken in their sense; then how comes this *great Body* of Christians meerly by their mistake of its sense, in thinking that our Lord means as the words sound, that *the Eucharist is his very proper Body*, and so *adoring* it (as they ought, should it be so) how come they, I say, to commit such *great Idolatry*, as the Dr. in his Book charges them with, and so all without *Repentance* of it, if *Idolatry* be a *Mortal* Sin, necessary in their *salvation*?

And if, from a *Major* part of the *present* Church interpreting Scripture, an Appeal be made to a Major part of the *ancient* Church, preceded *to interpret them on the Protestant side*, neither will this relieve the Dr. because, [whether this also *on the side Antiquity stands*] is a thing in Controversy, (for deciding of which we are to presume here likewise that, a *sincere endeavour* being allowed to all parties to understand the sense of the *former* Church, this also stands on that side the greater part apprehends it. Now the present much Major part of Christianity professeth to follow the sense of the *Ancient Church*, in interpreting this Scripture of a Corporal Presence. *Consid.* p. 17

§. 7. To this *Query* of *N. O.* How the Controversy shall be decided, when, in a matter of *Necessity*, we contend to understand the Scripture *clear* on our own side, and that which is *Truth* on the other?

minime

winning Controversies in Religion by a Living Judge is not built on any sufficient Foundation of Scripture or Reason; i.e. as I understand him, there is *no necessity* of it. [Mr *Chillingworth* made such an Answer before him, but more clearly, in these words ‖ —*That those places of Scripture which contain things necessary, and wherein errour were dangerous, need no infallible* [Judge, or] *Interpreter, because they are plain: and those that are obscure need none, because they contain not things necessary, neither is errour in them dangerous.*] But the Reader may observe here, that the Dr. saith only, *of determining Controversies in Religion*; leaving this term *Controversies* indefinite (as is usual with him); when as *N. O.* speaks not of Controveries in general, (many of which he grants not necessary to be decided) but expressly of controversies *in points necessary*; that it is requisite *the true sense* of Scripture herein be some way or other cleared, else Christians cannot know what to believe in them. Upon which reason the Dr. himself also, in his Principles, ‖ pleads a necessity that the Scriptures be clear in them.

‖ p. 59.

‖ *Princ.* 13. §. 8.

2ly. He tels us *p.* 130. —*That there are means of attaining the certain sense of Scripture in doubtful places, without the supposition of an Infallible Guide*; and (6) makes a long discourse from p. 197. to p. 260. concerning the *Means* used in the *Primitive* times, and the many good *Rules* given by the *Ancients* for this; As, *a diligent comparing of Scriptures; Considering the scope, design, connexion; whether the sentence be literal or figurative; illustrating the difficult by plainer places; prayer; study; recurring to the Original Tongues*, &c. Where he does enquire how controversies may be decided for those persons, who, after all these *means* used, remain still in some *doubtfulness*, or also for those, whose low and mechanick condition or weak judgment cannot *examine* these things: can neither *compare Scriptures*, nor *search the Testimony of Antiquity*, &c. To which I answer, That it is not much later to adhere to their *Guides*, though fallible, who are used with those other helps (the Dg mentioned) for discerning these things to be committed to their judgment, much likelier [*sic*] even hereto, than the others?

§. 9. Next I find him, when some twenty leaves have been spent in shewing [illegible] p. 240. declaring this, as the sense of the Church, (as quoted by him, and so also I suppose, his own. —*That, if after examining and considering Scripture, &c. the defendant still maintains, and that it be not against the Rule of Faith in express words, but about the sense of it, then, if the Court General Council be duly determined, which hath great weight in matters of difficulty, and such a Council [illegible]*

Reasonable

reasonable we should yield to them; but, if there have been none such, then that the unanimous consent of Fathers *is to be taken, so it be in some new and upstart Heresies.* And so saith he—*There is no necessity of Infallibility in the Guides of the Church to give us a certain sense of Scripture: which was the thing to be proved.*

But, here are several things that leave us still without a Determination of such Controversies, so as in them to have any settlement of our Faith. For 1. he saith, *If Ancient General Councils have determined it*, &c. But I ask, When may *Antiquity* and such obliging authority expire? and What if such ancient General Councils have not, and some latter General Councils have, determined it; whether is it not reasonable we should yield to them? and Whether the *Church*, in all *ages* since the Apostles, hath not the *same* and *equal* Authority? Otherwise, if a certain distance from the Apostle's times doth alter this Authority, why may not the *Arrians* put in such an exception against that of *Nice*, not held till after 300. years? and so much more against other Councils later than *Nice*? Again, since *new Controversies* in Necessaries may arise in *latter* times which such ancient Councils have not considered or decided, as there did, after 300 years, several such as had not been discussed or so resolved before, thus we shall have *no Judge* left for deciding them: lastly when any Controversy ariseth concerning the *Determinations* of ancient *Councils* or *Consent* of *Fathers* in any such Point, surely some Judge we must have for determining this, before the Controversy can be determined. §. 11. 1. 2ly The Terms he useth—*It is reasonable we should yield to them* are general and ambiguous. Doth he mean—It is reasonable to yield our *assent* unto them? Else how do such Decisions direct our faith or belief at all in these necessaries? 3ly, He saith—*So it be in some new and upstart Heresies.* But why may not this unanimous consent of Fathers be taken against *whatever* opinions, Elder or newer, that contradict them? But, if this Author means reasonable to yield our *assent* unto them; and if, to lawful *General Councils* of *whatever* times, he allows the same and *equal authority*; and will admit the authority of the *latter* to resolve any disputes touching the consent or statings of the *former*; what other thing is this but to come home to *N. O's* Infallible Guide, which is *lawful General Councils*, or other known unanimous consent of the Church-Governours, Ancient, or Modern? Which Councils also, for the matters they do decide, are a standing Guide not only to those present times when they sit, or wherein they live, but to all *Posterity*. And so this Author at last hath pitched upon that very means of ending *Controversies* in *Necessaries* (where the sense

sense of Scripture, is disputed, and other means, the comparing of Scriptures, &c. as to many, are either not practicable, or effectless) which he had endeavoured to avoid: the truth of which I leave to the Readers examination.

§. 11. This to the Dr's *Principle* as restraining the clearness of Scripture to Necessaries to Salvation. Next: In its affirming the Scriptures in such necessaries clear to men only on this condition, *viz.* their using a *sincere endeavour* for knowing the right meaning of them (wherein also I suppose he includes the divesting themselves of all *passion* and *Interest* that may any way blinde them in the search of *Truth.*) N.O. hence observes, that no private person can be secure of their *right* understanding them, till they are first assured of having used a *just* endeavour and reduced themselves to a clear indifference and disengagement: And by what means may they be certain of this? Or are not the *simple* or illiterate obliged to use much *greater* industry herein, than others? And thus, one being left to himself, all things will be still in suspense. For Example. The *Socinians*, esteemed as great *Scripturists* as any, it is, by all of them erring to this day in a necessary point of Faith, very manifest that, according to this *Principle*, they have not used a sincere and upright endeavour to understand them: Nor yet the Major part of the Christian World in some other Necessaries to have used *their* endeavours aright, if the Dr. have so used *his*: for, *these differ* from him in this sense of Scripture. How then shall any be assured of his having used a just diligence herein? Or, will not all be driven for the want of this assurance, notwithstanding the truth of such a *Principle*, to their Obedience and submission of judgment herein to the *Church*? And the same may be said of ones duty of using also other *helps* besides his own industry, as their repairing to the instruction of Church-men or others more learned; which helps for their understanding *of matters that are doubtful and require skill to resolve them* ‖ the Dr. owns and recommends in his *Answer* to *N.O.* though in his *Principles*, speaking of Necessaries, he forbears to mind the sincere endeavourer, or sober enquirer, of them at all: One would think, because the consulting such *helps*, if recommended by him, would have seemed to imply (as indeed it doth) some *non-clearness* of Scripture at least to such persons, contrary to the Dr's *Thesis*. Here, I say, how shall one know when he hath sufficiently used such helps also herein? But, if a person may be certain when he hath done so, so may he be, when he hath not; namely, when upon searching he is not certain that he hath; and so, all those that erre in necessaries, suppose the *Socinians*, and *Roman-Catholicks*, must be affirmed, if they

‖ p. 267. 269.

they examine it, conscious to themselves of a defect herein.

§. 12. But after this, the Dr. allowing the same effect of such sincere endeavour, to all sorts of persons, to the *unlearned* and Plebeians, as well as the *Divines* and Doctors, this *sincere* seems to mean not *all possible*, endeavour, such as is learning the *languages*, perusing *Commentators*, &c. but, as Mr. *Chillingworth* (who anchored his whole Religion upon it) states this point, ——*such a measure thereof as humane prudence and ordinary discretion* (*their abilities, and opportunities, and all other things considered*) *shall advise*: And, thus, such a clearness in necessaries must the Scriptures be affirmed to have, as suites with the very lowest capacities. Such a clearness, I say, even as to all the Articles of the *Athanasian* Creed, if these be esteemed *necessaries*; and even as to the *Consubstantiality* of the *Son* with God the *Father*. In which notwithstanding the whole Body of *Socinians* dares to oppose all Antiquity, upon pretence of *clear Scripture* to the *contrary*. But then, such a sincere endeavour put, as the *meanest* persons are well capable of using, how can we deny it to be used also by the *Church Governors*, and so by it them also well to discern all necessary Truth? and then may not the simpler sort with all safety rely on their judgment: and rather, in a due humility, suspect a defect in *their own*, than in *their*, endeavours? But of this more by and by.

Consid. p. 16

Chillingw. Answ. to Prefac. §. 26

CHAP. II.

Concerning a Necessity of Church-Guides for the instruction of Christians in Necessaries.

§. 13. II. SEcondly, Whereas this *Principle* of the *Scripture's* being so *clear*, as that every one, who sincerely endeavours it, may understand their sense in all things necessary to their salvation, is advanced by the Dr. as he often saith, thence to inferr no necessity of any *infallible Society* of men to instruct and guide Christians in such necessaries, *N. O.* in the second place observes *Consid.* p. 24. that from such a Principle seems to follow something more than haply the Dr. would willingly admit; *viz.* the *non-necessity* of any Society at all, fallible, or infallible, to explain these Writings, as to Necessaries, unless perhaps these Teachers may be said to be left by our Lord either for others to supersede their endeavours, or else only for instructing them in *non-necessaries*. And again, p. 49. upon the Dr's assertion, *Princip.* 19. ——*That the Assistance which God hath promised to those who sincerely desire to know his*

Consid. p. 24

Consid. p. 49

will may give them greater assurance of the truth of what is contained in the books of Scripture; than is possible for the greatest Infallibility in any other persons to do. N. O. observes, that whatever Divine Assistance is there advanced by the Dr. against the assurance that can be received from *Church-Infallibility*, the same is more against any assurance that may be had from the same *Church fallible*: and that thus it happens more than once in these Principles, that in too forward a zeal of demolishing the one, the other also was dangerously [that is, as to this particular, the need of the Clergy for instructing the people in necessaries] undermined by him.

Consid. 83. And again p. 83. upon the first *Consequence* drawn by Dr. *St.* from his own *Principles*, *That there is no necessity at all or use of an infallible society of men to assure men of the truth of those things of which*

‖ p. 84. *they may be certain without them*, &c. observes; that this concludes the uselesness as well of any *Ecclesiastical* Authority, to teach men, as of an *Infallible*, to assure men of, the truth of those things, which by using only their own sincere endeavour they may know without them. So that as by this Principle he takes away *Infallibility*, so doth he also the *Office* of Gods Ministry, though not as to every thing (in the proof of which *Church-Authority* and *Office*, as to many other things, the troubled Dr. would relieve himself in his Answer); Or, as to this, of *Teaching* the people, if he will, as to *non-necessaries*, Yet, as to this, the need that there is of any such Clergy for teaching the people in the *Necessaries* to their salvation.

§. 14. The Reader may see, for this, his *Reply*, in his Answer to *N. O.* from p. 260. to p. 278. a reply long enough to be good.

See p. 264, 262. 267. 270. 273. 274. Wherein he will first needs suppose, that *N. O.* chargeth him, by this Principle with undermining or taking away *All* Church Authority ‖: and next, shews, that he maintains still a *manifold* Authority in the Governors of the Church; as this, *Of their inflicting Censures upon offenders, commonly called the Power of the Keyes: Of their making Rules and Canons about matters of Order and Decency in the Church: Of their proposing matters of faith, and directing men in Religion*; where he mentions also this *the particular instruction of persons doubtful* [which those using sincere endeavour may well be in things not necessary, and so wherein the Scripture may not be clear], *and the publick declaring* [i. e. in Sermons] *what is the mind and will of God contained in Scripture in order to the salvation and edification of the souls of men: Of declaring what*

p. 267. p. 268. *errours and abuses there are, and doing as much as in them lies to reform them.* But, concerning that only point *N. O.* speaks of, namely, a necessity

a necessity of this Ministry, Clergy, or Church-Authority for guiding Christians in Necessaries to their salvation, so that they cannot by their own endeavours attain the knowledge of all these sufficiently without them, I find not a word; he that can, let him. So that *N. O's.* charge remains still in force; and, could I find any such thing in him, I see not but it must point-blank contradict his *Principles*, and the words of his *first Consequence* he draws from them but now recited.

§. 15. I find him saying there indeed, p. 266. —*That there are some common Principles of Religion that are or may be known to all; and some precepts so plain that every Christian without any help,* [I understand him here, any help either of his Guide or any else,] *may know them to be his duty.* And also, *that within the compass of these plain and known duties lies the capacity of persons judging of their Guides, if they carry them out of their beaten way* &c. [which Guides therefore he holds may misleade them in these Principles: so that here is not only their not needing Guides, but, if need be, di-or-cor-recting them].

§. 16. Again; I find him saying p. 267. —*That these Guides may be of great use for the direction of unskilful persons in matters that are doubtful and require skil to resolve them*: but this is not in matters *necessary*; for, if the Clergy, *here*, may be needful or useful once, so surely an *infallibility* of them would be more.

And he saith p. 189. —*That he doth not deny, that there are doubtful and controvertted places, but* [denies] *that the sense of Scripture is so doubtful and obscure in the things which are necessary to mens salvation, that persons without an infallible Guide cannot know the meaning of them.* And again —*We do not deny, that there are places of great difficulty in the Books of Scripture, but we assert, that the necessaries to Salvation do not lye therein.* And afterward —*If a person then by reading and considering these things* [believe and] *do what Christ requires for his salvation, what need is there such a one should trouble himself about an infallible Guide?* I add; or about *any* Guide at all, as to such matters? For, where one *knows* a thing once, no Guide (fallible or infallible) is necessary for his *knowing* that thing. And if an infallible Guide is not necessary here, it must be because a person may know the certain sense of such Scriptures without him; but, if he knows the certain sense without such a Guide, so may he without any Guide fallible also; for the fallibility of a Guide surely doth not render the Scripture more certainly knowable by him, than an infallibility doth: and therefore in such case neither a fallible Guide necessary.

§. Pag. 273. I find him saying —*That he nowhere so to be heard*

excludes the use of all means and due helps of Guides and others for the understanding the sense of Scripture; [i. e. where Scripture doubtful:] but such he affirms it not to be in necessaries to the just endeavourer to understand it; of whom, and which, *N. O.* speaks. And, if it be said, though not to the just endeavourer, yet to such others as will not use their own endeavour such Guides may be needful or useful for directing them in necessaries; so also I suppose will be a Guide *infallible*, that so such may not *err* in necessaries after their having consulted them. *Ibid.* I find him excusing himself, that in the Principles he drew up, *he no where mentions these due helps of our Guides, because his business was only about the Foundation of Faith, and whether Infallibility was necessary for that, or no.* But then, he ought to speak nothing for the excluding Infallibility, that doth also exclude as well such due helps. And again, as he mentions, in his laying this foundation of faith, *a sincere endeavour*, so ought he any *other* helps, without which, as well as without a sincere endeavour, he holds the understanding of Scripture, though clear, cannot be had.

§. 18. Again, p. 274, he saith that——*If all those things which are necessary to salvation are plain in Scripture to all that sincerely endeavour to understand them, it doth not hence follow that there can be no just authority in a Church, no use of persons, to instruct others.* [but he saith not to instruct them in these *necessaries*, already plain to them]. So he asks there——*If he should say that the necessary rules for a mans health are so plainly laid down by* Hippocrates, *that every one, that will take the pains, may understand them, doth this make the whole Profession of Physick useless?* To which who would not answer, Yes; as to such person, taking such pains, for his understanding the necessary *Rules of health*; but not therefore useless as to all *other* things? P. 275. I find him distinguishing between *Necessaries to Salvation and to Government*; and granting, that for *Church-Government* these Guides are necessary. But meanwhile *N. O.*'s enquiry is concerning the other member, how needful they are for knowledge of *necessaries to Salvation*. Again Ibid.——*That as Christians are joined together in a Christian Society, many other things are necessary for the end, besides what make them capable of Salvation.* And ‖ ——*that men understanding what is necessary to salvation, yet have need to be ruled and governed. True*: but, thus, the Church-Men are required for Rule and *Government*, but not for *instruction* in necessaries to Salvation.

‖ p. 276.

In all this I find no necessity of a Clergy for guiding Christians in necessaries; and, if there be, should he not have mentioned the consulting them, (if it were but for the *Independents*

dents, and *Quakers*, and other extravagant *Sects* that may read him), as well as mention the uſing a *ſincere endeavour*? and ſhould he not have given the reaſon thereof; Becauſe *Scriptures* in ſome points neceſſary are *obſcure* without their uſing ſuch help; and not, that they are in all theſe clear?

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Duty of Obedience and ſubmiſſion of Judgment from the Church's Subjects to the Definitions of the Church-Governors in Divine matters; and in theſe the more, the more they are Neceſſary.

III. N. O. advanceth yet further againſt the former *Principle*; That the Church's Subjects have an Obligation of Obedience and ſubmiſſion of Judgment in matters of *neceſſary* Faith to their Eccleſiaſtical Superiors; and that, conſidering both the ſpecial *Ordination* and *Commiſſion*, of theſe perſons from Chriſt for teaching to the World the Truths neceſſary to Salvation; and his charging others to *obey* them; and alſo, their own *ignorance*, and their Superiours ſtudy and *Learning* in ſuch things divine, they therefore ought to depend upon and adhere to their directions ſo much the more in any point of Faith by how much it is eſteemed more neceſſary; as, wherein there is a much greater hazard if they ſhould err. §. 19.

To this purpoſe *N. O.* urgeth Eph. 4. 11, &c. ‖ *That our Lord hath given* as *Apoſtles* and *Prophets*, ſo *Paſtours and Doctors for the conſummation of the Saints, for the Work of the Miniſtry, for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt* [ſurely this in neceſſaries to their Salvation] *untill all meet into the unity of faith, into a perfect man* —*That* [henceforth] *they may not be* [as] *children waved and carried about with every wind of Doctrine in the wickedneſs and craftines of men to the circumvention of Errour.* Where the Apoſtle naming the Deſigne of this Divine Conſtitution of theſe Perſons, to be *perfecting* of men *in the unity of the Faith* it would be too much violence uſed upon the Text to limit ſuch an Inſtitution only to a Guidance in *non-Neceſſaries* to Salvation, upon the account of Neceſſaries ſufficiently clear to all men [*i. e.* uſing a right endeavour to underſtand them] in the Scriptures. §. 20. ‖ *See* 1 Cor. 12. 28.

Again *N. O.* urgeth 2 Pet. 3. 16. Where S. *Peter* obſerves, that in his time *ſome perſons* [for any thing we know diligent §. 21.

ligent enough, yet through want of learning and the instability of not adhering to their Guides] *being unlearned* (saith he) *and unstable, depraved some places of Scripture, hard to be understood, to their own destruction*; which shews also these Scriptures hard to be understood in points necessary: else, how their *destruction* follow their erring? and shews their erring in these also not to be only for want of *diligence*, or *Devotion*, or from their *perverseness* or *folly*, where the Dr. in his Answer || to this Text, (for the rest he passeth by,) would chiefly place the reason thereof, but for their want of *learning*, saith the Apostle, and of *stability*, i.e. in adhering to their true Guides: and, as the Dr. grants, for want of Judgment, which care and diligence cannot always supply. Urgeth also the Apostles Precept Heb. 13. 17. of *obeying our Prelates and submitting to them, as those who watch over, and must render an account of, our souls*; and ver. 7, 9. of *following their faith: and not being carried about with diverse and strange doctrines* [which obedience and following their faith surely is not intended only as to non-necessaries]: and urgeth our Lords Command also—*si non audieris Ecclesiam*; that he, who in matters of controversy did not stand to the determination and sentence of the Church, should be held as an *Heathen* and a *Publican*.

|| *p.* 190.

§. 22. N. O. adds; That under the *Law* also were appointed *Judges* beside the letter of it; which was not penned with such clarity, but that doubts and controversies might arise concerning the sense: doubts, saith the Text, not only *between blood and blood, stroke and stroke*, &c. but also *between law and commandement, statute and judgment* || seeming to gain-say one another; which doubts arising, their addresses were to be made to these Judges, and whatever their sentence was, *according to the sentence of the law that these should teach them, and according to the judgment that they should tel and inform them; they were to do*; and that upon pain of death. *To do, according to such sentence*: not only to acquiesce in and yield some kind of external submission to, their determination and sentence (so as men do to these of secular Courts) as to non-resistance, and the undergoing such mulcts or punishments as were imposed on them; without being obliged meanwhile at all to assent to, or believe, the truth of that which they determine, or consequently act always according to it, as thought just and lawful, [an answer the Dr. gives in his *Rational Account*], and to which in his late *Reply* he refers † *N. O.* who had before perused, and remained unsatisfied with, it; made, as by him, so by *Chillingworth*, and other Protestants]: but (as *N. O.* expresly cautioned || against any such answer) *to do according to such sentence*, when they were

Consid. p. 25

|| 2 *Chron.* 19. 6.

|| *p.* 239.

† *p.* 116.

|| *p.* 25.

enjoyned

enjoined the observance of some law, that was formerly misunderstood by them and so broken, and disobeyed. Where, none can can be obliged to do a thing, as the Jews were by those Judges, but is by the same decree obliged to assent and believe the doing it lawful. And, that this seemed clear enough from the words of the Text: for who can reasonably interpret them thus? *Thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall shew thee, to the right hand or to the left* (ver. 11.): that is, *Thou shalt not decline* in not paying the mulct in which they shall fine thee; or, not undergoing the corporal punishment they shall inflict on thee: *Thou shalt observe to do according to all that they shall inform thee, and according to the sentence of the law that they shall teach thee* (ver. 10.) that is, thou shalt suffer what they impose, but not obey what they enjoin. Again, that they were to do according to such sentence, *upon pain of death*, not then only when the *Litigants* do acknowledge their sentence to be (*juxta legem Dei*) conformable to God's law; (for, then, what sentence of the Judge would stand good?); but, so often as the *Judge* should declare it to be conformable to God's law; And when will a Judge declare his sentence to be otherwise? Lastly, that if such an obedience as this, were now performed to supreme Ecclesiastical Governours and Judges under the Gospel, more would not be desired.

§. 23. Thus the *Considerations*. And the Reader may here seriously consider; Whether, if out of the *Gospel* were produced in expresse words the like command concerning our Ecclesiastical Governors in Relation to it, Namely: *If there arise a matter too hard for thee &c.* [in the Scriptures of the Gospel] *thou shalt come to them and they shall shew thee the sentence of Judgment. And thou shalt do according to the sentence which they shall shew thee; Thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee. Thou shalt not decline from their sentence to the right hand or to the left* &c: Whether I say such an answer touching Obedience, as is given here to the same words in *Deuteronomy*, would any way satisfy him. Therefore here Dr. *St.* at last thinks fit to deny such an *absolute* obedience due now under the Gospel to Ecclesiastical Governours, as was under the Law. His words are—‖ *We are ready to yield such an absolute Obedience, when we see the like absolute Command for Ecclesiastical Judges of Controversies of Religion, as there was among the Jews for their Supreme Judges in matters of Law.* ‖ p. 116. Much-what like to which is that, he saith in his *Rat. Account*†—*If we had met with any thing so expresse,* [viz. concerning such Judge in the Gospel] *nay that had any seeming tendency this way, how readily should we submit our Controversies to his determination?* † p. 241. To which I answer, 1st. That

That by this he seems to retract his former answer given to the words in *Deuteronomy*; || *viz.* that they infer no more obedience, than that which is required by, and afforded to, *all Courts of Justice*; and, that they include not *any obligation to assent to what is determined as infallible truth.* 2ly. I say, since now under the *Gospel* we have a written Rule no more free from *Controversies*, than that given by *Moses*; and so, since there is the same necessity of such Judges, we may rationally conclude, our Lord Christ under the Gospel hath left us no more destitute of such a remedy to end debates, than he did those under the Law. 3. lastly, that the former Texts and others || that establish the Church's Hierarchy do include the like command of *absolute* Obedience to such *Judge*: only this upon the pain of a Spiritual, not Temporal, Death.——*Sit tibi sicut Ethnicus.*

|| *Rat. Acct.* p. 239.

||*See* 1. *Dis. concerning the Guide in Controversies*, §. 7.

§. 24. As for that Text, *Lev.* 4. 13, 15.——*If all the multitude of Israel be ignorant, and through ignorance do that which is against the commandement* &c. which he urges || to prove the Law-Guides also liable to errours (though this is not the matter here in dispute) the like expression occurring *Lev.* 5. 2, 3, 4. shews this to be spoken of an ignorance not of the *Law*, but of the *Fact*; as if one hath touched some unclean thing and be ignorant of what he hath done. But then, taken in the Dr's. sense, this Text seems still more to confirm an absolute obedience yielded by this people to this *Grand Council*, else the *Whole* would not have been involved in their Errour.

|| *Rat. Acct.* p. 241.

§. 25. To his other objections mentioned Ibid.——*The Priests all along the books of the Prophets charged by God with ignorance and forsaking his way*; *and* (2 Chron. 15. 3.) *Israel having been for a long season without the true God, teaching Priests, and Law*; *and lastly the High Priest and Sanedrim condemning our Blessed Saviour.* I answer: * That under the Law God in all times had a *Visible* Church in the Nation of *Israel* consisting of Priests or Clergy, and people, not erring in Fundamentals and Necessaries; and this Clergy instructing and guiding the people in such necessaries; as which people had no Copies of the Law; and therefore as the Dr. often inculcates, God was not deficient in manifesting by some *other means* to them his *will*, of whom he exacted to obey it. That, in the Apostasies of *Israel* such Church continued still in *Judah*; and that, in the two great Apostasies also that happed in *Juda* under *Ahaz* and *Manasses*, we find a *Ministry* or *Clergy*, that was persecuted before, concurring and acting in the *Reformation*, together with the Kings *Hezechiah* and *Josiah*. And, * that such Church, whose Priesthood in necessaries erred not, continued according to the

the Promiſe, *Gen.* 49. 10. till the appearing of the *Meſſias*. Laſtly, * that the *Meſſias* coming with Miracles & manifeſted by the other two Perſons of the Trinity, by the *Father* with a Voice from Heaven, commanding to *Hear Him*, and by the *Holy Ghoſt* ſeen deſcending on Him, as alſo by the Baptiſt, was now from henceforth to be received as the ſupreme *Legiſlator*; and nothing to be admitted from others or from the *Sanedrim* it ſelf contradictory to what he taught; which High *Court* therefore now, for the accompliſhment of his neceſſary Sufferings, was permitted by God to be the greateſt *Enemy* of *Truth*, and guided therein not by *God's*, but a *Satanical* Spirit: Of whoſe Doctrines therefore our Lord warned the people often to beware, and when he bids them, all that the Phariſees, who yet poſſeſſed *Moſes* his Chair, taught them, that to obſerve and do, it is neceſſarily to be limited and underſtood, wherein *their's* contradicted not *his* Doctrines and Expoſitions of the Law. The Texts therefore mentioning the Prieſts *ignorance* or *falling away*, the Nation's being without *God, Prieſt, or Law* &c. are not to be underſtood univerſally, but of *ſome* part of this *Nation*; as in the time of the Judges; or afterward of *Iſrael*, when the true Church and Prieſthood continued ſtill in *Judah*; or of *ſome* part of the *Clergy*, and that perhaps a greater, in *Judah* ſomtimes apoſtatizing from God's true Religion and the Law of *Moſes*; but then, theſe by ſuch Apoſtacy were clearly cut off from the *Church*, and the whole Authority and Judicatory Power remained in the *reſt* not ſo apoſtatized, though ſuppoſed fewer; by whom the true Religion, when afterward meeting with a well-affected Prince, from time to time received a reſtauration.

Hence therefore *N. O.* deduceth, that, God having directed us, for learning our right way, to the *obedience* of a Guide, he doth take no prudent or ſafe courſe, who, committing himſelf to Gods immediate aſſiſtance ſhall neglect it; and break his commandement in hope of his favour and help. *Conſid.* p. 57 p. 51.

And, if *Obedience* be once thus granted due to our *Spiritual Guides* as to learning Neceſſaries: Next, That it is not hard to know, in any diviſion and diſagreement of theſe, whoſe judgment, in ſuch a caſe every Chriſtian ought to follow and adhere to, namely always to that of ſuch Church-Authority as is the *Superiour*; which in moſt caſes is indiſputable; this *Eccleſiaſtical Body* being placed by the Divine Providence in an exact *ſubordination*. As here in *England* it is not doubted, whether we are to pay our obedience rather to a *National* Synod, than to a *Dioceſan*; to the Arch-biſhop, or Primate, than to an ordinary Biſhop, or Presbyter. That ſo alſo, in the Catholick Church, the *Subordinations* among its Gover- §. 26. *Conſid.* p. 81

nours, both as to ſingle *Perſons*, and *Synods*, are well known; and our obedience, in any conteſt or competition, due ſooner to our *Biſhop*, than to a *Presbyter* oppoſing him; to the *Primate*, than a *Biſhop*; the *Patriarch* than a *Primate*; and amongſt the Patriarchs to the Patriarch of the *Prime* Apoſtolick See; the ſame Subordination being alſo to be obſerved, for preſerving the Catholick Church perpetually in one *Faith* and one *Communion* from *Hereſy* and *Schiſme*, in their ſeveral Councils, *Dioceſan*, *Provincial*, *National*, *Patriarchal*, & *Oecumenical*; and in any of theſe Courts which conſiſt of many, when any diſſenting in its members, here again our obedience due to the *major* part joined with the *Preſident* thereof. That therefore, by the Church-authority, to which Chriſtians are to render their obedience, is meant ſtill that Superior and more comprehenſive Body of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, which, in any diſſent and diviſion of the Clergy, according to the *Church-Canons* ought to be obeyed; and which hath hitherto, in her Supremeſt and moſt generally accepted *Councils*, in all ages from the beginning required ſuch ſubmiſſion, and juſtly aſſumed to itſelf the title of the only authentical Interpreter of *Scripture*, and authoritative Teacher of Divine Verities. And,

Conſid. p. 82 then, That obedience being ſetled here, he, who hath any ſmall experience in Church-affairs, and is willing to obſerve his duty, cannot but diſcern what way the *major* part of Chriſtendom, and its higher and *more comprehenſive* Councils, that have hitherto been, do guide him; this being a Body not inviſible, or latent in a Corner; or a few divided from the whole; but a *City* always ſet on an *Hill* in ſuch an extended Unity of an External Communion, and ſuch a dignifyed Preeminency and univerſality of its Prelats, as no other Chriſtian Society can equal; a *Candle* on a *Candleſtick*; a

Conſid. p. 89 perpetual erected Viſible *Pillar* and Monument of Traditionary *Truth*, *fruſtra Hereticis circumlatrantibus*.

§. 27. To *N. O.*'s thus ſubjecting our obedience, as to the deciding of Controverſies in matters Neceſſary, in any diviſion of Clergy, to the Superior and more comprehenſive Body of the Eccleſiaſtical *Hierarchy* according to the well-known *Subordinations* thereof, and ſo excluding the liberty either of *private* perſons, or alſo of *Churches* or *Synods*, any way ſubordinate, from *diſſenting* from the Judgment and Determinations of ſuch as are their *Canonicall Superiors*; which, if obſerved, would preſerve the Catholick Church for ever in peace and from all Rents and Schiſms: the Dr. returns ſeveral *Replies* in juſtification of the proceedings of the *Church* of *England*, as *N. O.* thought, much concerned in it, and not

not to be vindicated herein from a *Schism*, in her Reformation (not without, but) againſt a Superior Church-authority. This matter he diſcuſſeth from p. 280. to p. 285. where he ſeems to me ſomwhat unreſolved what *anſwer* to ſtand to. One while he ſaith †—*That the Church of* England *in reforming herſelf did not oppoſe any juſt authority then extant in the world.* Now, that *Patriarchal* or *General* Councils are a Superior Eccleſiaſtical Authority, to which *National* Synods or Churches owe ſubjection, is granted by learned *Proteſtants*. As, concerning *Patriarchal Councils* thus Dr. *Field* ‖—*Theſe Patriarchs* [meaning thoſe chief Biſhops of the Chriſtian world that contained under them the Metropolitans and Biſhops of many Kingdoms and States: every Church, as he ſaith, being ſubordinate to ſome one of the Patriarchal Churches, and incorporate into the Rules of it ‖] *might convocate the Metropolitans of their ſeveral diviſions, and hold a Patriarchal Council; which was of greater authority, than either thoſe in the ſeveral Provinces, or of a whole Nation, becauſe it conſiſted of more, and more honourable Biſhops.* Again p. 557.—*That the Decrees of Popes made with the conſent and joint concurrence of the Weſtern Biſhops did bind the Weſtern Provinces that were ſubject to him as Patriarch of the Weſt.* And thus Biſhop *Bramhal* †—*What power the Metropolitan had over the Biſhops of his own Province, the ſame had a Patriarch over the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of ſundry Provinces within his own Patriarchate.* And afterward—*That Patriarchs had authority to convocate Patriarchal Synods, and preſide in them, when Metropolitan Synods did not ſuffice to determine ſome emergent differences or difficulties.* So, in *Schiſme Guarded* p. 349. he ſaith—*That the Eccleſiaſtical Head of the Church is a General Council; and under that each Patriarch in his Patriarchate; and among the Patriarchs the Biſhop of Rome by a Priority of Order.*

† p. 180.

‖ p. 518.

† *Vind.* p. 257.

It is clear alſo, that moſt of the Councils (all either General, or Patriarchal for the Weſt, and conſiſting of the Metropolitans and Biſhops of many Kingdomes or National Churches, thoſe of the Church of *England* being alſo a part) ſince the 6th or 7th Age have determined ſeveral points of Faith rejected and oppoſed by the *Church* of *England* in her *Reformation*: the obligation of which Definitions and Decrees alſo doth extend not only to the times wherein they ſate, but to all *Poſterity*, till an *equal* authority ſhall repeal them; elſe the Decrees of *Nice*, or of the other firſt Councils would not oblige any after-times. Manifeſt alſo, that the *Council* of *Trent*, called by the Weſtern Patriarch upon this diſceſſion, and conſiſting of all or the moſt of the Churches in Chriſtendome (except thoſe under the Mahometan tyranny), §. 28.

not only of the *Roman*, but other *Italiok* Churches ſubject to other Princes, of the *Gallican*, *Spaniſh*, *German*, and other Weſtern Churches, and its Definitions in matters of faith generally accepted by theſe Churches, hath made definitions contrary to the *Reformation* of the Church of *England*; which Decrees (to uſe Dr. *Fields* words) *made with the conſent and joint concurrence of the Weſtern Biſhops* [I add, or of the moſt part of them; for, of all is not neceſſary, no more than in the firſt Councils: for, ſo, no Metropolitans or Biſhops could be liable to the cenſures of Councils without their own conſent;] *do bind the Weſtern Provinces ſubject to the Patriarch of the Weſt.* And therefore, theſe things conſidered, I ſee not how the Dr. can make good theſe his words, that the Church of *England* oppoſed no *juſt* Superiour Church-Authority.

§. 29. Afterward, as not truſting too much to this Anſwer, he pleads the freedom of the Church of *England* from the Pope and Church of *Rome*: and, from this, diſcourſeth of it as abſolutely free. To which purpoſe he ſaith p. 281.——*When it was thus agreed* [*i.e.* by the Church and State of *England*] *that the Biſhop of Rome had no ſuch authority as he challenged, what ſhould hinder our Church from proceeding in the beſt way it could for the reformation of it ſelf? For the Pope's Supremacy being caſt out as an uſurpation, our Church was thereby declared to be a free Church, having the power of Government within it ſelf.* For this alſo, he ſaith p. 285.——*that it enjoyeth the rights of a Patriarchal See.* And, whereas *N. O.* in that very place the Dr. anſwers to, † expreſly names for this Superiour Authority *the moſt Supreme and moſt generally accepted Councils that have been in all ages* (which words might put him out of doubt what *N. O.* meant by *more Superiour and comprehenſive Body*, and by *more Univerſal Church*) this Replier,‖ very conveniently omitting this, cloſeth together what immediatly precedes and follows it in *N. O.* (of which the Reader, if he pleaſes, may inform himſelf by viewing the place): and then takes the liberty to deſcant upon him in this manner p. 281.——*That which* N. O. *calls refuſing ſubmiſſion to all the Authority then extant in the world: was all the authority then extant ſhut up in the Pope's breaſt?* And p. 283.——*That by the more univerſal Church* N. O. *fairly underſtands no more but the Church of Rome.* Whereas *N. O.* whether ſpeaking of Superiour Authority, or its Infallibility, hath made no where in his Book any application of it to the *Church of Rome*, or *Pope* at all; but to *Superiour Councils*. But, hither it much concerned this Author to force *N. O.'s* diſcourſe, to be the better able to confute it; So p. 282. he tels his Reader——*The plain Engliſh of all is, the Church of Rome*

† *Pref. p. 5.*

‖ *See p. 280.*

was

was againſt the Church of England; [*i.e.* in the Reformation]. But, after all this excurſion, *N. O.* ſpeaks of an obedience the Church of *England* owes to Superiour Councils, Patriarchal, or General; and to thoſe, whether former or preſent: and, that ſhewing its Freedom from the *Pope*, or *Church of Rome*, as a Co-Metropolitan Church, will not ſerve the turn: nor yet, its being a Patriarchal, *i.e.* a Primatical, Church; or, had it been yet in an higher ſenſe *Patriarchal*: for, neither was *Dioſcorus* excepted from ſuch a Superiour Authority by being a Patriarch.

§. 30. Another while p. 283. he conjectures *N. O.* by *more univerſal Church* may mean *the greater number of perſons* [or of Chriſtians] *at the time of the Reformation*: and ſo he asks—*How he knows that the Eaſtern, Armenian, Abyſſine, and Greek Churches did agree with the Church of Rome againſt the Church of* England? But, though this is a truth, (which the Reader may ſee proved at large in the Third *Diſcourſe* concerning the *Guide* in *Controverſies* Chap. 8.) and that very conſiderable, that the Church of *England* in many points of her Reformation oppoſed the general doctrines and practices of the *Oriental* as well as *Occidental* Churches; and, where a general conſent is in the Church-Governours apart, the ſame we may preſume would be in a *General Council*; yet *N. O.* letting this alone, ſpeaks, not of a *greater number* of perſons, but of a *Superiour* Authority.

§. 31. Another while he pleads p. 282. the Church of *England's* ſubmiſſion to, or conſent with, *the Church Primitive and Apoſtolical, or the truly Catholick Church of all Ages, which ſhe hath always appealed to and offered to be tried by*. But the Catholick Church of all ages being taken here by Him not diſtributively, for what the Authority of the Catholick Church in any age hath ſtated or determined [For, to this he often declines ſubmiſſion. See in him p. 241. 242. Where he ſaith—*That Univerſality in any one age of the Church, taken without the conſent of Antiquity is no ſufficient Rule to us*: And—*That the Church in any one or more ages ſince the Apoſtles times may be deceived*]: But only collectively, for what it can be ſhewed to have held & delivered and agreed-in in all ages, Such a ſubmiſſion, I ſay, is not ſufficient; For, as our obedience is due to the Decrees and Definitions of lawful General, or other Superiour Councils of the *Primitive* Times, ſo is it as well to thoſe of any *latter* age, the authority of them in any age being *equal* and the ſame, and an equal neceſſity of it for deciding the Controverſies in Neceſſaries that may ariſe in any age, though theſe Points, diſputed, do not appear, ſave in the Traditional Principles from which they are deduced, in any former. Nor could the *Arrians* juſtly

juſtly decline the Definitions of *Nice*, becauſe made in their times; or, in the ſame expreſſions, not delivered in any more primitive age. There alſo he ſaith,—*that the Church of* England *rejected nothing but innovations, and reformed nothing but abuſes.* But, none ought to be rejected or reformed by any particular Church as *ſuch*, which Superiour Councils in any times have declared to be otherwiſe, eſpecially where no *contradiction* of a Body of *equal* Authority can be ſhewed in times more ancient.

§. 32. || p. 283. Another while || he urgeth, that at the time of the Reformation there was no ſuperiour authority to the Church of *England* extant upon this account, becauſe ſaith he—*This muſt either be the authority of the Pope and Councils of the Roman Church, or a General Council of all the Catholick Church. For the firſt, we owe no obedience to them; for the ſecond, there was no ſuch thing then in the world, & therefore could not be oppoſed.* But here firſt, if by the *Councils* of the *Roman* Church he means Councils aſſembled by the Weſtern Patriarch, and conſiſting of the Metropolitans and Biſhops not only of the Roman, but other Weſtern, Churches, and Nations, theſe muſt be confeſſed, and ſo are by *Proteſtant* Divines, Superiour to a *National* Synod of *England*. And then, as for theſe, or for other, *General Councils*, in what former times ſoever held, they are an Authority *always extant*, and their decrees obliging, ſo long as not by an *equal* authority repealed: Otherwiſe, the Obligation alſo to the Definitions of the firſt *General Councils* would be long ſince expired. And alſo any particular Church is obliged to a ſubmiſſion to any ſuperiour Council following ſuch Reformation, from the time of its Decrees paſſed, and a due acceptation of them, *i.e.* by a much major part.

§. 33. After this *he* alledgeth—*That, for the Canons of the Catholick Councils before the breaches of Chriſtendome, no Church hath been more guilty of a violation of them, than the Church of Rome.* But firſt, if this were granted, another's faultineſs excuſeth not our's. Next, if he ſpeaks of the Councils that have been in the Church till the breach made by *Luther*, methinks this is enough to confute what he ſaith, that the one Church, the Roman owns, and admits the Definitions and Canons of theſe Councils, as *true*, *regular*, and *obliging*; (and ſo in its diſobeying them condemns it ſelf) which the other, the Reformed, denies to be ſo.

§. 34. Laſtly, p. 285. he pleads,—*That every free Church, enjoying the rights of a Patriarchal See, hath according to the Canons of the Church a ſufficient power to reform all abuſes within itſelf, when a more general* conſent *cannot be obtained.* But not, I hope, when a *more general diſſent* is already declared; (I mean, that the things

ſo

ſo called, are no, abuſes.). By all this I think, appears no Anſwer as yet returned by this Author to the things objected which affords any reaſonable ſatisfaction. *N. O.* then proceeds.

§. 35. That, in Point of Obedience, though it is moſt true; that a Chriſtian *is bound to reject whatſoever is offred to be impoſed upon his Faith*, which is *certainly known* to ſuch Chriſtian to have no foundation in, or to be contrary to, *Gods Word* ||; Yet learned Proteſtants do alſo require from ſuch Chriſtian, that, where not *demonſtrably* certain of the contrary, he ought to ſubmit to the *judgment* of *this Authority* for the knowing what things are revealed in this *Word*, and what are contrary to, or not founded in, it: and (to uſe the Dr's expreſſion ||) *to be guided by the ſenſe of Scripture as it is interpreted by this Authority*. And Dr. *St.* himſelf alſo *Rat. Account*, p. 539. for preventing the exorbitancies and capricious humours of any fantaſtical Spirits, & for the knowledge of ones errors, when theſe manifeſt & intolerable, what ſober enquiry ſoever their ſincere endeavours may pretend to, cals for *their conformity, in interpreting of Scripture, to the concurrent ſenſe of the Primitive Church, the Common Reaſon of Mankind* (*that ſuppoſeth Scripture the Rule of Faith*), *the conſent of Wiſe and Learned Men*: Or, on the ſide of theſe ſincere endeavourers who ſhall disbelieve this authority he requires no leſs (with the Archbiſhop, and others) than *Demonſtration* for that, wherein they diſſent. And this Demonſtration not ſome improbable argument, ſo miſcalled, but *which being propoſed to any man, and underſtood, the minde cannot chuſe but inwardly aſſent thereto*; that is, that which every reaſonable man, underſtanding the terms, aſſents to.

|| *See Dr. Stillingfl. Princ.* 29. *Conſid.* p. 73.

|| *Rat. Acc.* p. 375. 59.

§. 36. Where, Proteſtants may do well, as to this duty of Obedience, ſeriouſly to conſider theſe things. 1. Whether *all thoſe* do not ſtand ſtill obliged to obey the general Doctrines of the Church before *Luthers's* Reformation, who can bring no *demonſtration* of the contrary? and Whether it is upon ſuch a demonſtrative certainty, as this, in the points controverted, that *they themſelves* oppoſe this Church-authority teaching them otherwiſe? 2ly. Whether, ſince it is to be judged no *Demonſtration* (as Proteſtants define it) that doth not convince all rational perſons to whom it is propoſed, which the *Proteſtants* Demonſtrations manifeſtly do not, therefore the Demonſtrations pretended by them be not even in their own judgment *fallacious*? 3ly. Whether *the Common Reaſon of Chriſtian Mankind*, and the common *Conſent of Learned and Wiſe Men*, named but now by the Dr for regulating a private man's belief, ought not to be taken, where all men are not united

1.

2.

3. *Conſid.* p. 74.

in

in the ſame judgment, for the *moſt common* ſuffrage and teſtimony of the *preſent* Univerſal Church? And then, Whether we ought not to credit this *preſent Univerſal Church* ſooner than any other, touching what is the concurrent teſtimony of the *Primitive Church*, in caſe this ſuffers any debate? And then, if particular Perſons are not to depart from this judgment of Authority, till they have *Demonſtration*, (that is, their own *certainty*, as to ſuch point), to ſhew againſt it; then, Whether, in ſtead of their calling for *Church Infallibility*, that they may believe her, the *Church* may not rather demand their *Demonſtrations*, why they believe her not? See ſuch things agitated by *N. O.* p. 74, 75. paſſed over by the Dr in ſilence.

§. 37. Next: That, ſetting here aſide any Command or duty of Obedience in this matter, Yet that in all prudence the *Plebeian* and *unlearned*, for the underſtanding of *Scriptures*, ought to acquieſce in the judgment of ſome that are more *skilful* and ſtudied in them: and this the more, as the points are more *neceſſary*; (wherein is ſuppoſed any difference in Judgments; for, that argues ſome *difficulty* in the thing): and that the Dr's *Principle* ſeems to afford a very good Reaſon of the *Submiſſion* of *Judgment* to the Church, which ſubmiſſion it oppoſeth. For, if Scriptures be maintained ſo clear in Neceſſaries, that every one uſing a right endeavour cannot miſtake in them, then ſhall the Church-Governours much rather, by reaſon of this *clearneſs* obvious to every ruſtick, not err in them; and ſo ſhall the people, the more clear the Rule of faith is proved to be, the more ſecurely rely on, and be referred in them to, their direction: and that we have all reaſon to preſume that the chief *Guides* of the Church, (even a General Council of them, or, if it be but a major part of this Council, it is ſufficient) in their Conſults concerning a point *neceſſary* to *Salvation* delivered in *Scripture*, uſe at leaſt ſo much endeavour, (for, more needs not) as a plain ruſtick doth, to underſtand the meaning of it. Or here, whatever other thing is ſuppoſed neceſſary beſides a ſincere endeavour, or is underſtood to be included in it, (as *Freedome* from *Paſſion*, and *Secular Intereſt*, or alſo a freely profeſſing the truths which their ſincere endeavour diſcovers to them,) none can rationally imagine but that theſe *Supreme Church-Governours* ſhould be as much or more diſengaged herein, than private men; as having, in their already poſſeſſed Dignity and Preferment leſs ambitions or compliances; and more freedom, and leſs dependence on, or ſubordination to, others, in their actions or fortunes. Then, concerning their *integrity* and *ſincerity* in their *Judicature*, it is ſaid by *N. O.* that, what they deem for others, they define for themſelves alſo;

Conſid. p. 17

alſo; and that their own ſalvation is as much concerned, as any other man's is in their miſtakes. [I add; or in their purpoſely falſifying Truth in their Decrees, and deceiving others in what they are not miſtaken or deceived themſelves; ſo, as that their ſubjects, ſatisfyed of their skil, yet cannot truſt their fidelity: If any can be ſo uncharitable as to credit of them ſo great a wickedneſs, that the *Supreme Councils* of the Church ſhould with deſigne decree an *errour* contrary to their *faith*, and that in matters *neceſſary*; and then enjoin all their Subjects, under *Anathema*, to believe it: wherein they moſt certainly do devote themſelves, if not believing ſuch their Decree, to Eternal Perdition].

§. 38. To ſuch things argued by *N.O.* D. *St's* anſwer p. 141. is this——*Granting, that the Guides of the Church, ſuppoſing the ſame ſincerity, ſhall enjoy the ſame priviledge* [as any private man hath, of believing rightly in neceſſaries], *which*, (ſaith he), *I know none ever denied them: Yet what is this to their Infallibility in teaching all matters of faith?* [ſuppoſing them to believe aright, yet what is this to their teaching right matters of faith] *which is the only thing to be proved by* N. O. *So that all this diſcourſe* (ſaith he afterward) *proceeds upon a very falſe way of reaſoning; from believing to teaching, and from neceſſaries to ſalvation, to all matters of faith, which the Guides of the Church ſhall propoſe to men.* Thus he. Where, firſt, he corrupts *N.O's* expreſs words and ſenſe; who argues from particular men's *not erring* in *Neceſſaries*, by uſing a ſincere endeavour, the Church's *not erring* in *Neceſſaries*, if uſing the like: See *Confid.* p. 17. 18. 19. *The Church-Governour's not-erring*, ſaith *N.O.* not, their not mis-teaching. But indeed, the firſt being granted, *N. O.* thought the other alſo muſt be believed, in the Church's General Councils. Again; *in Neceſſaries*, ſaith *N.O.*; not in *all* matters of faith: which word *All* is put in by the Dr. ſeveral times, perhaps to relieve himſelf for framing ſome Anſwer. Next; the Dr. denies not, that theſe Church-Governours may rightly underſtand all neceſſaries upon a ſincere endeavour; nor, that a ſincere endeavour is uſed by them. How can he? ſince that endeavour which may be uſed by any *Mechanick* he holds *ſufficient*: But is neceſſitated to pitch upon this: That ſuch *Fraud* and *malice* may be uſed by the Church-Governours even by *General Councils*, that they ſhal teach, and define to and for their Subjects, and exact, upon *Anathema*, their aſſent to, the contrary errour, (and that in matters neceſſary) to what themſelves believe: and hence contends that a private man cannot ſafely adhere to their ſentence or Decrees. So that the *Church's Infallibility*, he now

controlls, is not an Infallibility in not erring or in believing aright in *necessaries*, here granted to the Church-Governours in like manner as to mechanicks, but only their Infallibility in *Teaching* to others the same *necessary* things, which they themselves believe: and by their *Infallibility* here is meant not passively their not being deceived, but actively their not deceiving: and *N. O.* is required to prove the contrary. Now, I had thought the Infallibility of the Church or of General Councils, he had quarrel'd with, had been *a non possibility* in them of *erring* or *not believing* aright in some necessaries, as he hath expressed himself heretofore frequently in his *Rat. Account.* part 3. ch. 1. treating *Of the Infallibility of General Councils*, and according to his Description of it *passively* before in this Answer p. 80. —*Infallible is that which cannot be deceived*, where also he cashiers the Notion he is glad now to take up. And Now, it seems, *N. O.* in proving these Governours their believing aright in necessaries, hath lost his labour; *his discourse proceeding* as the Dr. saith, *from a very false way of reasoning from believing to teaching*; and that the *Teaching* of a General Council in necessaries what it doth believe (for, of these General Councils there *N. O.* speaks, who for this reason requires obedience and a submission of private men to their judgment in such necessaries) *is the only thing to be proved by* N. O.

To prove which, a thing that seems of it self evident, it is enough to say, it hath that *moral certainty* in it which generally Church-Tradition is said to have; *viz.* that so many such persons cannot conspire in such a matter, *viz.* a necessary to salvation, to falsify the truth, against their own belief and conscience, to all their Subjects, and to Posterity; with an *Anathema* to all Dissenters; when themselves also are such. And had it not here been much better for him, if not out of charity or reverence to so Sacred Persons, yet from the irrationality of such a defence, to have passed over this Objection of *N. O.'s*, as he hath done many other, in *silence*? But, if a further proof yet be exacted of me, I say; that our Lord's *Promises* of their not erring in *necessaries*, and the commands of our obeying what they teach, do engage to us, as to Necessaries, their not teaching amisse; as without which their *teaching* us *right*, we have no security or benefit of their *not erring*. And so I leave these things to the Dr's. Reflections.

§. 39. Again *N. O.* further affirms, p. 48. in the behalf of a *prudent Obedience*; That, whatever *fallibility* and liability to mistakes even in necessaries the Church-*Guides* are subject to, Yet that there is much more hazard to the most of Christians, [their capacities

cities being very *little*, abſtracting from the directions of a Guide; their mean condition void of *learning* or *Leiſure*; and a thing uncertain alſo, when they have uſed a *due endeavour*; and this a prejudice of it not rightly uſed, if they do not diſcern in theſe Scriptures the pointing out this *Guide*, *which* (ſaith *S. Auguſtine*) *the Scripture without any ambiguity doth demonſtrate*; and which repaired to may demonſtrate to them, what elſe is neceſſary]; That there is much more hazard (he ſaith,) in adhering to their *own judgment* (excepting only this, if any ſhall have a *demonſtrative certainty* of his private opinion againſt his Guides) than to that of their *Guides*, though theſe fallible: for, whereas, in following ſuch Guides, ſuch perſons may fall into *ſome* errours, and perhaps ſome of them great ones; in this latter way of following their own Apprehenſions the unlearned may fall into a thouſand; and ſome of theſe much *greater*, and groſſer, than any ſuch Chriſtian Society or Body of Clergy will ever maintain. That God hath made no promiſe to preſerve in *truth* thoſe who deſert his Guides to *direct* them, nor to reward their *diligence* in other ways, who live in *diſobedience*. Witneſs, here, the unhappy *Socinians*, and ſo many groſs Sects of late, much more abſurd in their tenents, than thoſe other who remain in a conſtant ſubmiſſion to the Miniſtry and Religion eſtabliſhed by Authority in the *Proteſtant* Churches. And that better it is, in the erring alſo of theſe Guides, that all erre *their* errours; for ſo at leaſt there will be ſome *Unity* and *Peace*; and, for Inferiours ſo mis-led ſome *excuſe*, and in probability more veriſimilitude in their miſtakes, than that every one ſhould err a *ſeveral*, and *his own*, errour, both to the utter ruine of *Peace*, and a greater deviation from *Truth*. Nay, if from ſuch Subjects could only be obtained, in a liberty of their Opinion, the obedience of *ſilence* and *non contradiction*, thus would be ſecured the Peace of the Church; and the Propagation of ſuch Sects, (which muſt be either by Writing or Diſcourſe) prevented. But, as things ſtand here [2] from our own being aſſured (by the Drs [1] *Principle*) of our rightly underſtanding, and not erring in, all neceſſaries; and then, we [2] from it rightly collecting, that others, who hold the contrary to us, do err ſo; and [3] then, that, ſuch errour as in a *neceſſary*, being judged not tolerable, neither may this obedience of *Silence* be therein obſerved: from theſe, I ſay, muſt needs break out daily many *new* Reformations, all founding themſelves upon the juſtneſs of the *firſt*: and this a Reforming too not of *themſelves* only, but of ſo many others as they can perſwade, as it was in the *firſt*: which all of them juſtify.

Contra Creſcon. l. 1. c. 33.

Conſid. p. 100.

§. 40. The things here the Dr. returns, in shew of an Answer, against the former Obedience so much pleaded by *N. O.* are delivered by him from p. 142. to p. 180. in several *Propositions*. Where I find him saying p. 142. *That God hath entrusted every man with a faculty of discerning Truth and falshood, supposing that there were no persons in the world to direct or Guide him*; Which is willingly granted him, in confidence that this will not take away all *Submission* of *judgment*, to our Superiours; or, to persons more prudent.

§. 41. Again; p. 143. *That this faculty is not taken away, nor men forbidden the exercise of it in the choice of their Religion by any principle of the Christian Religion*; Which is granted also; and yet, a Religion *being chosen* by us, it may well be both an act of prudence and of duty to submit our judgment to our Superiours in whatever they shall define, and especially in matters of *Necessary Faith*.

§. 42. Again, p. 144. *That the exercise of this Faculty was not to cease as soon as men had embraced the Christian Doctrine*. Granted, as the former: and yet our submission of this our Judgment, to what doctrines our Superiours shall define, be both our *duty*, and a most *rational* act of this our Judgment; and any perswasion of our judgment (not rightly used) to the contrary no way excuse our non-submission from *guilt*. I say, as the exercise of this faculty doth not cease, so it must be rightly used; which it never is, when, used, it at any time dissents from the doctrine of our Lord, or his Apostles, or of lawful General Councils, whereto is required its assent.

§. 43. Again he saith p. 146. *That the Authority of Guides in the Church* [i.e. for their determining truths in necessaries.] *is not absolute and unlimited, but confined within certain bounds*; [and afterward he saith, *confined to a Rule*] *which if they transgress, they are no longer to be followed*. Be it so, when they transgress against their Rule, if this be certainly and *demonstratively* known by any, such person is not to follow them: this is confessed already by *N. O.* But, who is appointed Judge of these Supreme Judges, when they transgress against this *Rule*? or, when their Subjects have Demonstration for this? Their *Subjects*? who are from them to learn the sense of the Rule, where difficult and disputed; and who are bidden to follow their faith? The *right* exercise of our judgment will not judge so: but will judge, that, if *Demonstration* were on his side, these Supreme Judges, having all the same Evidences, would have discovered it sooner than he; or at least have discovered it, when related to them by him; and also the Protestants Definition of it concludes it none, if these Judges do

Consid. p. 73

do not discern it such. Who then, since he is not excused from sin and disobedience by using his judgment, if he judge amiss, will not think it the safest way still to continue his *submission*? The *Socinian*, in judging the Council of *Nice* in their Definition of Consubstantiality to have transgressed the Rule they are confined to, and so not to be followed, is not hereby released at all from his obedience to this Council, or excused in his dissession from it. That authority is none, that is only to be obeyed, where the Subjects are to approve first of its *sentence*.

§. 44. Again p. 148. he saith——*He allows a very great authority to the Guides of the Catholick Church, in the best times of Christianity; and looks upon the concurrent sense of Antiquity as an excellent means to understand the mind of Scripture in places otherwise doubtful and obscure.* First, for the limitation of places *doubtful and obscure*; This seems to render such Authority useless as to *Necessaries*: in which this Author will have the Scriptures clear and perspicuous. Next, a right judgment cannot but account all those places so, in the sense whereof either the ancient or present *major part* of Christianity are of a contrary judgment from himself. Lastly, the looking on such a *concurrent sense as an excellent means &c.* is short, and will not serve the turn for the unity of faith; it must be looking on it as a *Rule* requiring our *obedience*, when such sense is declared by their Councils.

§. 45. He proceeds p. 149.——*That in matters imposed to be believed or practised, which are repugnant to plain commands of Scripture, or the evidence of sense, or the grounds of Christian Religion, we assent that no authority of the present Guides of a Church is to overrule our faith or practice.* But the same thing is here replied as before §. 43. in answer to that in his p. 146. concerning the Guides transgressing the Rule.

§. 46. P. 151. He goes on,——*That no absolute submission can be due to those Guides of a Church who have opposed and contradicted each other; and condemned one another for errour and heresy.* True: not to both, but to one part It is: and *N. O.* hath told him that it is to the *Superiour*; Or, in the *Supreme* Court, where a party dissents, to the *major part* joined with the *President*. Lawful Supreme Councils contradicting one another in matters of necessary faith are not by this Author, nor cannot be, produced.

§. 47. P. 172. He saith,——*That in the present divided state of the Christian Church a man that would satisfy his own mind must make use of his judgment in the choice of his Church, and those Guides he is to submit to.* True? now; and in all former times, wherein also have been Divisions and Anti-Communions in the Clergy, and

Guides

Guides against Guides, that we are to make use of our judgment in the choice of a Church. But, our Judgment here must be used rightly; and, being so, tells us, both that we are to obey those, who are found, by this judgment, to be our lawful Spiritual Superiours; and which, in such divisions, be so. And whenever, in this, our judgment is not used rightly, but mistakes, we are never a whit the more, by this so used, released from our Obedience.

Generally in these Answers here is the exercise of our Judgment or liberty to Judge pleaded against absolute Obedience or Submission of it; as if the proving of the one annulled the other; when as himself urgeth, ‖ liberty of Judging may be used also concerning the *Apostles* Authority, and their Doctrines; and yet this liberty well consistent with an obligation of *absolute* Obedience to such their Doctrins & Authority as infallible: So, then, is it well consistent also with that to the Supreme Guides of the Church in their defining necessaries, if they be in these infallible; or, if fallible, yet with an obligation still of submission of Judgement to them, where any are not demonstratively certain of the contrary: Which demonstrative certainty of convincing all those, to whom proposed, no Protestants have, in matters debated with Catholicks.

‖ p. 144.

§. 48. Again, for qualifications of Obedience p. 178. he brings —*That we are not to submit to all those who challenge the authority of Guides over us*, though *pretending to never so much power and infallibility*. And p. 179, *not to submit to those who are lawful Guides in all things they may require*. Both which are most true; and yet well consistent with this, that we are to submit to our lawful Guides in *all* their Determinations in matters of *necessary* faith, if they Supreme, and Infallible herein: and, if they fallible, in all things of which we are not demonstratively certain to the contrary. Thus you see the Dr's Responsory Propositions are admitted, and *N. O's* Obedience no whit lesse established.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning Church-Infallibility as to Necessaries.

§. 49. 4*ly*. AGainst such Principle, and for *submission* of private mens *judgements* to that of the *Church*, *N. O.* presseth, as the Church's *Authority*, so yet further its *Infallibility*, that is, the *Infallibility* (not of the *Roman* Church, or of the *Pope*, as this Authour

Author will needs underſtand him, though no ſuch thing is once named in the *Conſiderations*, but) of the *Church Catholick*; of the Catholick Church in her moſt *Univerſal Councils* and Courts that can be convened for deciding Controverſies, and for declaring the true ſenſe of the Scriptures; eſpecially, if theſe Councils and their Decrees have ſuch a general acceptation with the Church Catholick diffuſive, as can be thought neceſſary to give us Its judgment, at leaſt us to a major part thereof. And again, *Infallibility* of ſuch *Councils*, (not as to any Queſtions or Controverſies whatever that may be propoſed to them, but) of all ſuch points as are any way *neceſſary* to ſalvation: (which neceſſity, if any need to know it, we are to learn from them). And *Neceſſary*, not as this word includes only thoſe Articles without the explicite belief of which none can enter into Heaven, but as it includes all thoſe points alſo, which either as to our belief or practice, are highly beneficial thereto (for, in theſe alſo the *right* guidance of our *Spiritual Paſtors* ſeems neceſſary), and as is explained before §. 2. &c: the Church alſo not undertaking, as *N. O.* ſaith, || to end all manner of differences, but ſo many wherein ſhe findes on any ſide ſufficient *evidence* of Tradition; and, for the gravity of the matter, a *neceſſity* of deciſion: The ſame Divine providence, that preſerves his Church perpetually Infallible in all things neceſſary to be determined, diſpoſing alſo, that, for all Neceſſaries, there ſhall be a ſufficient evidence of Tradition, either of the *Concluſion* it ſelf, or its *Principles*. *Conſid.* p. 44.

§. 50.

Now, for ſuch Infallibility *N. O.* firſt preſſeth: That the ordinary practice of General Councils, which hath been conſtantly allowed and ſubmitted to by the Church Catholick Diffuſive, neceſſarily inferrs their *Infallibility*; viz. their *inferring* from time to time (as they thought fit) their Deciſions in the *Creeds*, and their Anathematizing *Diſſenters*, and the Church Diffuſive afterward ſtiling ſuch Diſſenters *Hereticks* and oppoſers of the Faith. That ſuch aſſent and belief and ſubmiſſion of judgment if juſtly required by them, inferrs ſuch perſons herein not liable to errour upon the Dr's own arguing. For (ſaith he ||) *Where Councils challenge an internal Aſſent by vertue of their Decrees* [or, becauſe their Decrees are in themſelves infallible] *there muſt be firſt proved an impoſſibility of errour in them, before any can look on themſelves as obliged to give it.* That Proteſtant's allowing only an *External* Obedience, or *Silence* due to Councils fallible, ſhews, that Councils fallible can juſtly require no more; and, conſequently, that ſuch Councils are infallible, as do juſtly require more; as did the four firſt *Conſid.* p. 40. *Conſid.* p. 32. || *Rat. Acc.* p. 506.

and Councils, with the voluntary acknowledgment also and submission of the rest of the Body of the Catholick Church to such an Authority assumed by them. That *subordinate* Councils, when they have also sometimes stated matters of faith, censured Hereticks, and required assent to their Decrees, yet did this still with relation to the same *Infallibility* residing in the General Body of Church-Governours, and to their concurrence therein: whilst they did not pass such Acts without consulting the Tradition and judgment of other *Churches*, and especially of the *Apostolick Sees*.

§. 51. *Consid.* p. 38. That, had there been no Divine Writings, there must have been such a divinely-assisted *Infallibility* as for necessaries left in the Church Guides; for that without this the Christian, would otherwise have been no stable or certain, Religion, at least as to many necessary points thereof, so that all persons might have a *right* belief in them; because that *Tradition* carries not with it a sufficient evidence as to all points of necessary faith, especially as to all sorts of people; several Controversies about Necessaries having been raised, which have not been decided and ended by any then generally current Tradition; Or, the *Clearness* of *Scripture* supplyed this deficiency of Tradition, as to the capacities of all the members of the Church, without the convening & Consultations of Councils; who have cleared to their subjects the necessary Deductions from former Traditionals; without which Deductions several most pernicious *Heresies* would have undermined the former Christian Faith, that was, in precedent times, couched in more *general* Terms.

§. 52. *Consid.* p. 57. That Catholicks need not, in arguing against Protestants (who grant the *Scriptures* to be *Gods Word*), to use any other testimony than that of these Scriptures, for a sufficiently clear proof of such Infallibility residing in the Governours of the Church. Which proofs out of Scripture, every where obvious in Catholick Writers were by *N.O.* not thought so necessary to be produced where he made only some short *Reflections* on the Dr's *Principles*, and not a set Discourse of *Infallibility*, as this Author would misname it. But, since the Dr. so much misseth them (though I cannot but wonder why he so earnestly calls for what *N.O.* hath not said, whenas he so easily omits to speak to what he hath said) he may find several of them put together in the first Discourse *Concerning the Guide in Controversies* §. 7. &c. and there vindicated also from the glosses put on them by this *Author* in his *Rational Account*: and may finde them mentioned also here below in the *Annotation* on p. 113. l. 15. And, since the Doctor with other Protestants grants an Infallibility in Necessaries of the Church *diffusive*

ſive in all ages, from our Lords *Promiſe*, doubtleſs contained in ſome of theſe Texts, I appeal to any, after he hath read what is there alledged, Whether ſuch *Promiſes* in many of theſe *Texts* do not relate principally to the Infallibility of the *Church-Governours*; And again, Whether if the *Common Reaſon* of Chriſtianity, *i.e.* the Reaſon that is found in the major part thereof were to be conſulted concerning the true ſenſe of theſe *Texts*, the major part of Chriſtendome doth not and hath not believed Church-Infallibility, at leaſt in her General Councils, eſtabliſhed by them. A ſufficiently clear proof therefore of Church-Infallibility theſe Scriptures afford, if that proof may be called ſo which by the moſt of the Chriſtian World is taken to be ſo, notwithſtanding that a Party, engaged by their Reformation in an apparent contrary intereſt, do contradict it. Or if, whilſt they deny a ſufficient evidence of *Church-Infallibility* to be found in Scripture, they would allow a ſufficient evidence of *Church-Authority* eſtabliſhed there, to decide Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies with obligation to External Obedience, ſo it is that by this *Authority* they would be caſt and ſilenced for the former; if a much *major part* may be admitted (as it ought) to give law to the *whole*. *Conſid.* p. 57

§. 53.

To this I may add, that *de facto* the Dr. holds even the Church of *Rome* (*i.e.* in its *Councils*, and in the Pope, as *Preſident* thereof) to have been hitherto ſo divinely aſſiſted, as never to have *erred* in *neceſſaries*, neither in believing, nor declaring them; notwithſtanding all the by-ends of intereſt, and reputation, of which he accuſeth them, the *Force* and *Fraud* he chargeth on them. And this I gather from his words *Rat. Account.* p. 54.—*That the Church of* England *makes no Articles of Faith, but ſuch, as have the teſtimony, and approbation of the whole Chriſtian World of all ages, and are acknowledged to be ſuch by Rome it ſelf.* Therefore the *Roman* Church holds all thoſe which the Church of *England* doth; and ſo all neceſſaries; unleſs that of *England* alſo be defective herein. And all this the Dr. ſeems neceſſitated to maintain; for, elſe, the Roman failing, and the Oriental Churches being then no whit better than it, there would have been no *Catholick* Church, at leaſt as to the Hierarchy thereof, extant immediatly before *Luther's* time. And hence, though I grant it cogently follows not, that the Governours of the Church-Catholick ſhall never erre in neceſſaries for the future, Yet is there a ſtrong preſumption, that by the ſame Divine Aſſiſtance as they have been hitherto preſerved from it, ſo they ſhall be ever: and it is a rational Motive of private mens ſubmitting their judgment to the Church, that hitherto ſhe never hath, but private men by departing from this obedi-

ence, as ſeveral Heretícks, often have *erred* in neceſſaries. This here for our Lord's *promiſes* revealed in *Scripture*, (Of which a further Account is given below in Annot. on p.113.*l*.15.) & for the experience the World hath had of their accompliſhment hitherto.

§. 54. For juſtifying the ſame Infallibility *N.O.* || further preſ-
|| *Conſid.* p. 85. *&c.* 1. ſeth that noted Plea of S. *Auſtin* againſt the *Donatiſts*. 1ſt. That, whereas ſome Divine Revelations may be ſo obſcurely expreſſed in Scriptures, or involved only in their Principles, as that ſome weak capacities cannot diſcern them, Yet that in the ſame Scriptures ſuch perſons may alwaies diſcover the *Church* diſtinctly, *which is It* amongſt never ſo many pretenders, by certain Notes &
|| *Rat. Acc.* p.7. marks belonging to it; I mean not thoſe named by this Author || and other Proteſtant's (though theſe true Marks alſo) viz. *True Doctrine and a Right Adminiſtration of the Sacraments:* a Queſt or Trial, by ſuch marks that can never be made an end of, being a task to know all the truths in Chriſtianity what they are firſt, before we can know which is the Church: whenas the Enquirer ſeeks after the Church, that by it he may come to know theſe Truths: but by theſe other *Teſts* and *marks* following, as in ſeveral
|| *Contra Fundament.* *c.*4.-*De utilit. Credend.* *c.*8.16,17. --*De Unita. Eccleſ. c.*25. places he gives account of them || ——*Succeſſione Epiſcoporum ab Apoſtolicâ Sede* [Or, as *Contra Fundamentum*——*ab ipſâ Sede Petri Apoſtoli*] *fruſtra Hæreticis circumlatrantibus*; *Autheritate vetuſtate firmatâ*; *Conciliorum gravitate*; *Miraculorum majeſtate*; *Sequentium multitudine*; [i.e. as to the coherence in one Communion, no other Society or Party being ever ſo great]; *Populorum atque Gentium conſenſu, & famâ admodum celeberrimâ*; *Eccleſia ubique diffuſa, & non in aliqua parte terrarum, ſed ubique notiſſima.* Laſtly——*Ipſo nomine Catholicæ, quod non ſine cauſâ inter tam multas Hæreſes ſola obtinuit.* [which being the Marks of the Catholick Church by the Scripture-deſcription of it in S. *Auſtins* time muſt be ſo *for ever*:
Conſid. p.88 for that, if any ſhould apply theſe Scriptures more to S. *Auſtin's* days (as indeed ſeveral Proteſtants do) than to any other, or than to the preſent, by the ſame reaſon the *Donatiſts* might here have counter-applied them to ſome other, and not to S. *Auſtin's* times.] Thus then S. *Auſtin* affirms, from the Scriptures ſuch perſons may eaſily diſcover the *Church which it is.*

§. 55. 2. And then 2ly, may diſcover here, that it is a *Judge*, in other Controverſies which are not ſo clearly delivered in Scriptures, always to be conſulted, and ſtood to. Of which thus this Father writes in his diſpute with the *Donatiſts* concerning the ob-
Conſid. p.85 ſcure Point of *Rebaptization*——*Quoniam Sacra Scriptura fallere non poteſt, quiſquis falli metuit hujus obſcuritate quæſtionis, eandem Eccleſiam de illâ conſulat, quam ſine ullâ ambiguitate ſacra Scriptura demonſtrat.*

demonſtrat. And before——*Proinde quamvis hujus rei certè de Scripturis Canonicis non proferatur exemplum, earundem tamen Scripturarum etiam in hâc re* [*i.e.* in the point of Non-rebaptization] *a nobis tenetur veritas, cùm hoc facimus quod univerſa placuit Eccleſia,* [*i.e.* which hath been ſtated concerning that Point by the Church], *quam ipſarum Scripturarum commendat authoritas. Ut quoniam, &c.* Thus S. *Auſtin.* After which *N.O.* goes on: that all this ſaid by this Father is falſe, and ſaid to no purpoſe, if the Scripture be not clear in this, That this Church can determine nothing in ſuch important conteſts contrary to the verity of the Scriptures; and ſo in this that we ought to give credit to what ſhe decides: for, then, it would not be true what he ſays——*Earundem Scripturarum in hâc re* [in Non-rebaptization] *tenetur veritas,* when we do in this point what the Church decides, if the Church may, poſſibly, decide it amiſs. And again——*Quiſquis falli metuit hujus obſcuritate quæſtionis Eccleſiam de illâ conſulat,* would no way relieve his being deceived ſtill, if the Church conſulted might alſo be miſtaken in it. Nor would the ſame S. *Auſtin* have had any reaſon to preſume (as he doth *De Baptiſmo.* 1. l. 4. c.) that S. *Cyprian* would have corrected his opinion concerning this Point, and yielded to the Council's judgment: or any reaſon to charge the *Donatiſts* with *Hereſy* for diſſenting from it after the *Determination* of ſuch a *Council*; Nor the 2d. General Council have had any juſt ground to put it in the Creed, [*Credo unum Baptiſma in remiſſionem peccatorum*], if ſuch Univerſal Councils, in their ſtating matters of Faith, are errable and amendable. Which are *N.O's.* words || (by prevention) relating to that known paſſage in S. *Auſtin*——*Ipſaque plenaria Concilia ſæpè priora poſterioribus emendari*; and declaring, they can have no ſuch ſenſe as the Dr.|| and others impoſe upon them.

|| *Addit. to p.86 l.11.*
|| *Anſw. to N.O. p.255.*

Again, *p.*58. he urgeth, That, in the belief and profeſſion of this Church-Infallibility and ſubmiſſion of private mens Judgments to her ſentence paſſed in her Synods, the Tenet of the *Greek* Church ſeems no way varying from the *Roman.* That *Jeremias* the *Conſtantinopolitan* Patriarch in his Conteſt with the *Lutheran Proteſtants* is much in this, as a ſure Retreat for ending Controverſies, & eſtabliſhing Peace: where he tells them ||——*Quæ Synodicè* (*legitimâ Conciliorum ratione*) *mandata ſunt, ea ab omnibus fidelibus recipiuntur tanquam Scripturis divinitùs inſpiratis conſonantia.* And in the Concluſion of that Anſwer he ſaith ||——*Non enim nobis licet, noſtræ propriæ confidendo explicationi, aliquod divinæ Scripturæ dictum aliter intelligere, animadvertere, aut interpretari, niſi quemadmodum Theologis illis viſum eſt, qui a Sanctis Synodis in S. Spiritu ad pium*

§. 56.
Conſid. p.58
† *Reſp. 1. p.139.*
|| *p.142.*

ſcopum probati receptique ſunt: ut ne, ſi rectâ Evangelicâ doctrinâ & a verâ ſapientiâ & prudentiâ declinemus, mentis noſtræ cogitatio inſtar Pratei huc illuc circumferatur. Sed quæret aliquis, Quomodo iſta corrigentur? Quomodo? Deo adjuvante ſic. Nihil præter illa, quæ a Sanctis Apoſtolis, & a S. Synodis inſtituta & ordinata ſunt, in manus ſumendo, & ſentiendo. Qui enim hunc limitem terminumque rectè ſervat Syncherema a nobis erit, ſocius & fidei conſors. Again, in his Preface to the ſame Anſwer he ſaith——*Reſpondabimus ergo, nihil noſtrum afferentes, ſed ex Sanctis Septem Oecumenicis Synodis* [the laſt of which is that ſo befool'd by this Dr. in his Book of *Roman Idolatry*, p. 78. &c.] *& ex ſententiâ Sanctorum Doctorum Interpretumq; divinitùs inſpirata Scriptura, quos Catholica Chriſti Eccleſia unanimi conſenſu recepit, quando orationis & miraculis, tanquam alter Sol, orbem terrarum illuſtrarunt: cùm Spiritus Sanctus in eis ſpiraverit, per eoſque locutus fuerit, qua in æternum immota manebunt, utpote in Verbo Domini fundata. Eccleſia enim Chriſti (ut cum Paulo loquamur) columna eſt, & fundamentum, veritatis; cui ne portæ quidem inferorum (ut divina Domini promiſſio habet) prævalebunt.* That here we ſee in the *Eaſt* the ſame zeal for Councils and for Fathers (taken collectively) as an Infallible Guide, as is in the *Weſt*; and the like endeavour to reduce Proteſtants to the ſame acknowledgment and humble ſubmiſſion of Judgment.

§. 57. Conſid. p. 31 ‖ Archbiſhop Laud, 139, 140. compared with p. 160, 195, 258, 346. See alſo Rat. Account, p. 58, 59, 537.

Laſtly, *N. O.* inſiſteth p. 31. &c. That both Dr *St.* himſelf & Arch-biſhop *Laud* do ſeem to hold ſuch *General Councils* as have an univerſal *acceptation* from the Church Catholick diffuſive to be *infallible*. For, both theſe admit ‖——that the Church diffuſive is for ever preſerved infallible in all Fundamentals or Points abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation; and this, by vertue of the Divine Promiſe, *That the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt her*; and other Texts: and therefore ſuch Councils whoſe Decrees are admitted by the whole Church diffuſive muſt be ſo too. I ſay, *as to Fundamentals*; though as to other points not Fundamental, they affirm theſe Councils alſo liable to errour and fallible, becauſe the Church Catholick diffuſive (ſay they) is ſo alſo. Dr. *St.* alſo *Rat. Account*, p. 537. ſaith of ſuch Councils univerſally-accepted, ——*That both the truth of Gods Promiſes, the goodneſs of God to his people, and his peculiar care of his Church ſeem highly concerned that ſuch a Council ſhould not be guilty of any notorious errour.* Where we ſee he ſaith, that the truth of Gods Promiſes is concerned, that theſe Councils ſhould not fall into any *notorious errour*. Now ſuch an errour it muſt needs be, if an errour in *Fundamentals* or *neceſſaries*. And ſuch a notorious errour, I ſuppoſe, this among others would

would be, if they ſhould hold themſelves (when they are not) Infallible in their Decrees, and ſo ſhould require a general aſſent (ſuch as that in the *Athanaſian* Creed) from Chriſtians to them, as to Divine Revelations, and make them *De Fide*; thereby, in caſe any Decree be not true, obliging all the Members of the Church to an *Unity* in *Error*. Thus far, then, as to *Fundamental errours*, it ſeems Gods Providence ſecures both ſuch Councils, and their Subjects. And then alſo; for their erring in non-Fundamentals, both He and the Arch-biſhop put this among the *raro contingentia*. *Rat. Account. p. 535.*

§. 58. The Archbiſhop alſo is much in aſſerting the Catholick Church infallible not only in its *Being*, but *Teaching*; and that muſt be by its Councils.——Dr *White*, ſaith he, *had reaſon to ſay, That the Viſible Church had in all ages taught that unchanged Faith of Chriſt in all points Fundamental.* And again ||, *It is not poſſible, the Catholick Church* [that is, of any one age] *ſhould teach againſt the word of God in things abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.* Where the word [*teach*] ſhews that he intends the Governours of the Church in every age. Likewiſe in another place,——*If we ſpeak* (ſaith he) *of plain and eaſy Scripture, the whole Church cannot at any time be without the knowledg of it. And, If* A. C. *mean no more, than that the whole Univerſal Church of Chriſt cannot univerſally err in any one point of faith ſimply neceſſary to mens ſalvation, he fights againſt no adverſary that I know, but his own fiction.* Where it follows: *But if he means, that the whole Church cannot err in any one point of Divine Truth in general, if in theſe the Church ſhall preſume to determine without her Guide, the Scripture, then perhaps it may be ſaid, that the whole Militant Church hath erred in ſuch a Point.* Here then the firſt, *of the whole Church not erring in fundamentals*, as well as the ſecond, are ſpoken of the Church, as *determining*. And ſo is that ſaying of his, *viz.* That,——*Though the Mother Church, Provincial or National, may err, yet if the Grand Mother the whole Univerſal Church* [that is, in her General Councils univerſally accepted controlling the other Provincial or National] *cannot err in theſe neceſſary things, all remains ſafe; and all occaſions of diſobedience* [that is to the Grand Mother's commands] *taken from the poſſibility of the Church's erring* [namely, as to all neceſſaries] *are quite taken away.* Thus He. But *ſafe*, &c. it could not be, if the Catholick Church the Grand Mother, as ſhe held, ſo could not alſo *witneſs*, all the neceſſary truths againſt ſuch Mother Churches Provincial, or National. Here then an Infallibility in teaching, in determining &c, is an Infallibility of the Church in its Governours, not only believing, but *teſtifying*, the Truth. [Though

Conſid. p. 34.
Archbiſh. p. Laud. §. 37. p. 318.
|| *Ib. §. 21. p. 140.*
Ib. §. 25. n. 4.
Ib. p. 258.
Conſid. p. 36.

N. O.

N.O. indeed seeth not, how these things consist with what is said by Dr. *St.* elsewhere ‖——*You much mistake, when you think we resolve our faith of fundamentals into the Church as the infallible witness of them. For, though the Church may be infallible in the belief of all things fundamental (for otherwise it were not a Church, if it did not believe them,) it doth not follow thence necessarily, that the Church must infallibly witness what is fundamental, and what not*].

‖ *Rat. Account, p.* 154

§. 59. This Infallibility of Councils, if universally accepted, being thus granted by these persons: Next; as for the *Universal Acceptation*, the condition of this Infallibility, or of our assurance thereof; they allow the first four General Councils to have been so accepted, and therefore profess to them all obedience (and that which these Councils required, we know, was *Assent*). And concerning this Obedience and submission of Judgment to these, upon such an universal *acceptation* of the Church Diffusive, Dr. *St.* writes thus ‖——*The Church of* England *looks upon the keeping the Decrees of the four first General Councils as her Duty; and professith to be guided by the sense of Scripture as interpreted by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the four first General Councils.*——that is, she professeth to take that, which such Councils deliver, for the *sense* of *Scripture*; Not then to admit that which they deliver, if she first judgeth it to be the *true* sense of Scripture. So also elsewhere he saith;——*The Church of* England *doth not admit any thing to be delivered as the sense of Scripture, which is contrary to the consent of the Catholick Church of the four first Ages* [that is, in their Oecumenical Councils, as he expresseth it in the preceding Page]. And here also he gives the ground of such Submission, *viz.*——*a strong presumption* [he might have said, an absolute necessity, for, what he urgeth proves it] *that nothing contrary to the necessary Articles of faith should be held by the Catholick Church, whose very being depends upon the belief of those things that are necessary to Salvation.* These first Councils therefore being, as they allow, universally accepted, the Universal Acceptation necessary to render any General Councils infallible can be exacted no greater or larger, than that which these *first Councils* actually had; &, upon this account, the same title of Infallibility must be allowed by them to several others; yet whose Definitions in matters of Faith they oppose.

Consid. p. 32

‖ *Rat. Account, p.* 375.

‖ *Ib. p.* 59.

§. 60. Lastly, to that which this Author presseth against such pretended Infallibility in His Reply to the *Considerations*, p. 150. † and in his Principles, (and frequently elsewhere) ‖——*That in Opinions absurd and repugnant to the first Principles of Sense and Reason which any Church obtrudes upon the faith of men, men have the greatest Reason to reject the pretence of this Infallibility, as a grand Imposture:*

† *Conseq.* 4.

‖ *See Rat. p.* 117. 567. *Rom. Idol. p.* 540.

N.O.

N.O. *anſwers clearly to it thus.* † 1. That, where the Divine Power *ſupernaturally* worketh any thing that is contrary to our ſenſes (as no doubt it may), here we are not to believe them. And that this he thinks none can deny. 2. And next; That we are to believe this Divine power doth ſo, ſo often as *certain Divine Revelation* tells us ſo [becauſe we have no Divine Revelation herein *not* to believe them]; and yet we are not to believe the ſame Senſes in the thing wherein they inform us contrary, to what this Revelation tells us. For, otherwiſe *Lot* and his *Daughters* or the men of *Sodom* were not to credit the *Divine Revelation* (ſuppoſing that Divine Hiſtory then written and extant) that the *ſeeming Men* who came to *Sodom* were *Angels*, becauſe this was againſt their Senſes. Now here would he argue well, (as Dr. *St.* † and Dr. *Tillotſon* || do, againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*) who, becauſe *Lot's* ſight was actually deceived upon this ſupernatural accident, in taking the Angels to be Men, as certainly it was, from hence would inferr, that the Apoſtles had no ſufficient certainty or ground, from their *ſeeing* and *handling* our Lord, to believe him *riſen* from the *dead*? Or, that no *belief* could ever be certainly grounded upon our *Senſes*? which Senſes are appointed by God the ordinary inſtruments of conveying faith and his revelations to us, *viz.* by our hearing, or reading, them; and do afford a ſufficient certainty whereon to ground our belief in all things ſubject to them; excepting only thoſe, wherein we have ſome *Divine Revelation* of the Divine Power interpoſing and working ſomthing above Nature, & that in ſuch particular matter we are not to believe them. 3*ly*. Which Divine Revelation we are to learn [that is, where the ſenſe of the Scriptures, Gods word, is any way controverted] from *Gods Church* infallibly aſſiſted in neceſſary Faith [I add, or alſo by *Tradition*, evidently from age to age conveying to us ſuch a ſenſe of ſuch Scripture to be the true]. Thus *N.O.* to that obſtacle much urged of late, That no pretence of *Church-Infallibility* may be admitted in any thing, that is repugnant to our *Senſes*.

† *Conſid. p.* 92,93.

1.

2.

† *See Stillingfl. Rom. Idol p.* 540. *--Rat. Account, p.* 117,567.

|| *Rule of Faith, p.* 275

3.

§. 61.

And thus, ſince no truly Divine Revelation can be falſe, whether it ſtand with or againſt our Senſes, or ſeeming Reaſon, the diſpute here as to any particular point of our faith (ſuppoſe *Tranſubſtantiation*) is clearly removed from what is the evidence of *ſenſe* or ſeeming Reaſon in ſuch a matter, to what *certainty* there is of the *Revelation* its being Divine. Neither can we conclude any thing from the former evidence of our Senſes, where Divine Revelation is pretended contrary, till the latter evidence, that, of the certain truth of the Revelation is firſt diſproved. The evidence

therefore of *Tradition*, (an evidence sufficient, as for proving the Scriptures to be Gods Word, so for such or such sense of any part of Scripture to be Divine Revelation), not of our *Senses*, is first to be enquired after: Which Primitive Tradition interpreting Scripture, this Author also I think elsewhere saith, he will stand to.

§. 62. n. 1. And, if these things be so, his arguing in his *Rational Account* p. 567. (if he pleaseth to reflect upon it) cannot stand good; where he saith the Testimony of the Fathers carries not so great an evidence, as that of our Senses.—*The question* (saith he there) *in short is, Whether there be greater evidence, that I am bound to believe the Fathers in a matter contrary to sense and reason, or else to adhere to the judgment of them, though in opposition to the Fathers?* *And afterward*—*Supposing* (saith he) *the Fathers were as clear for you* (as they are against you) *in this subject, yet that would not be enough to perswade us to believe so many contradictions as Transubstantiation involves in it, meerly because the Fathers* [i.e. thus interpreting the Scriptures] *delivered it to us.*—*For, nothing but a stronger evidence than that of sense and Reason, can be judged sufficient to oversway the clear dictates of both*—So that, suppose Catholicks could prove, for example, for the literal sense of *Hoc est Corpus meum*, an universal consent of *Fathers* or of *Tradition*, yet what shall we be the nearer in dealing with such men, who say, they must rather believe the *evidence* of *Sense*; as being the *foundation* of the Christian *Faith*? But, if the evidence of our Senses, then, is to be preferred before that of Tradition concerning the Revelation; hence it follows, that so often as Tradition delivers God to have done any thing contrary to the evidence of our Senses (as, in the former Instance, God's sending *Angels* that appeared to *Lot* and the men of *Sodom* to be *Men*) so often the Tradition or Revelation is not to be credited for *Divine*, or any Text in God's Word concerning this not to be taken in its *literal*, (as that *Gen.* 19 1. implying them to be Angels) but in some *figurative*, sense, And is not this *cum ratione* (or *sensu*, if you will) *insanire*?

§. 62. n. 2. And, here, may we not use the same words, (as this Author doth in his *Roman Idolatry* p. 540 against *Transubstantiation*,) against such a sense of the 19th chapter of *Gen.* that these to Sense appearing Men should be really Angels—*I desire to know* (saith he there) *how the Sense* [he means in the Eucharist concerning the Bread; suppose we, of *Lot* and the men of *Sodom* here concerning the Angels:] *comes to be deceived, supposing a Revelation contrary to it* [*Viz.* that those whom they saw to be Men, were indeed Angels]? *Doth God impose upon their senses at that time? then he plainly deceives them; Is it by telling them they ought to believe more,*

than

that they ſee? that they deny not: but they deſire only to believe according to their ſenſes in what they do ſee; as (ſaith he) *in what they ſee to be bread, that that is Bread*; [ſo I, in what they ſee to be Men, that thoſe are Men.] &c.——*Beſides if this Revelation is to be believed* [by them] *againſt ſenſe, then either that revelation is conveyed immediately to their minds*, &c, *or mediately by their ſenſes* [which we affirm], *as in thoſe words, This is my Body* [ſaith he, and I, as in thoſe words *Gen.* 19. 1. *And there came two Angels to* Sodom]: *If ſo, then they are to believe this revelation by their ſenſes, and believing this revelation they are not to believe their ſenſes: which is an excellent way of making faith certain.*

Try we the ſame arguing again, in his *Diſpute* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Rat. Account* p. 117, by this Inſtance, That theſe Perſons being *ſeen* to be *Men* the Divine Revelation was not to be ſo underſtood, as that they were *Angels*. There he pleads thus——*If this Principle be true here, that the judgment of the ſenſes* [ſuppoſe here, of the men of *Sodom*, that thoſe perſons they ſaw were really Men, which he ſpeaks of the Euchariſt being really Bread] *was not to be relied on, in matters which ſenſe is capable of judging of, it will be impoſſible for any one to give any ſatisfactory account of the grand foundations of Chriſtian Faith. For, if we carefully examine the grounds of Chriſtianity in Chriſtian Religion, we find the great appeal made to the judgment of Senſe* (*That which we have ſeen, and heard, and handled*). *If then the judgment of Senſe muſt not be taken in a proper object, at due diſtance, and in ſuch a thing wherein all mens Senſes are equally judges, I pray tell me, what aſſurance the Apoſtles could have, or any from them, of any Miracles which Chriſt wrought*, &c.——*In things which are the continual objects of Senſe, if men are not bound to rely on the judgment of Senſe, you muſt ſay, that our faculties are ſo made that they may be impoſed upon in the proper objects of them; and if ſo, farewell all certainty, not only in Religion, but in all things elſe in the world.* And ſo all the reſt of his diſcourſe there, if any pleaſe to view that place, will paſs as currently againſt underſtanding the Text in *Geneſis* literally, that thoſe perſons were Angels whom *Lot* and all the inhabitants of *Sodom ſaw* to be Men, as againſt the General ſenſe of *Hocceſt Corpus meum*, that that is Chriſts Body, we *ſee* to be *Bread*; or rather collect from the Accidents we ſee, that it is ſo. §. 62. *n.* 3.

To what is ſaid by *N. O.* in this matter, I find no anſwer returned by him; Nor can I imagine how he can ſhape any, but by removing the Controverſy from what is the evidence of *Senſe* concerning the *thing*, to what is the evidence of *Tradition* con- §. 62. *n.* 3.

cerning the *Revelation* : till which cleared against the truth of any such Revelation, any evidence of or from Sense, or seeming-Reason, must be laid aside. Several of the other things that are here pressed by *N.O.* for Infallibility are also by the Dr in his Answer passed-over in silence (whether neglected by him for the slightness of them, or avoided for the difficulty, is left to the Reader's judgment) and some others, spoken to ; with what successe is now to be weighed.

§. 63. To that mentioned before §. 51. of the necessity of a perpetuall *Infallibility* in the Church-Governors for preserving a stability and Certainty in the Christian faith ; especially supposing there had been no *Scriptures* (as for some time there was not, nor, in every place, the presence of an infallible Apostle) or, supposing the sense of them in several such points *doubtfull*, he answers p. 124. to this purpose ; That mens Faith and Religion may be well grounded, stable and certain, either without *Scriptures*, or *Church-Infallibility*, *viz.* by vertue of common and Universal Tradition : instancing in the *Religion* of the *Patriarchs* received by *Tradition* without any such Infallibility ; and in Christian's receiving the Scriptures, or the Roman party maintaining Church-Infallibility upon *Tradition*, as a sufficient ground thereof. But *N.O.* speaks of a stability and certainty of the Christian Faith not as to some one or a few parts or points thereof (which as instanced in by the Dr, so are here willingly granted by *N.O.* to receive a sufficient evidence and firmness from Tradition antecedently to any Infallibility of the Church : for neither doth *N.O.* require *Church-Infallibility* for the proof or assurance of *Church-Infallibility*) : but, as to all the necessary parts and Credends thereof : to the believing of which, being not all of them, especially as to all sorts of Christians, delivered with the same evidence of Tradition, as the *Canon* of *Scriptures*, or *Church-Infallibility* are, he affirms this Infallibility necessary for the establishing a certainty in their faith, when such persons are left either without Scriptures ; or with Scriptures, in such points, of an ambiguous sense ; in which necessary matters surely it is necessary, that all men believe *aright* ; though not, that they have an *infallible certainty*, that they do so. Where (as *N.O.* observes) such an Infallibility signifies much, for men's having a right and saving faith in all these matters proposed by the Church then, when perhaps it may signify nothing, as to their infallible assurance of that which it proposeth.

Consid. p. 54

§. 64. Again ; to the proof of Church-Infallibility from the practice of Councils (allowed and submitted to by the whole Church,

Church Catholick diffuſive), in their requiring *aſſent* to their definitions in matters of faith upon *Anathema* to all diſſenters: in their *inſerting* them as thought fit in the Church's *Creeds*, and the Church Catholick upon this having eſteemed all oppoſers of them *Hereticks*, &c. mentioned before §. 50. He anſwers thus p. 128. *——That this argument is ſo weak, that he wonders* N.O. *had not conſidered how often it had been anſwered by their own Writers. For that it is certain, that Provincial Councils, as well as General, have* Anathematized *diſſenters, & pronounced them Hereticks;——& that* Bellarmine || *ſaith that this doth not imply their Infallibility. And that if it doth not in the caſe of Provincial Councils, why ſhould* N.O. *think it doth in the caſe of General?* Thus He. And whereas *N.O.* who had well pre-conſidered ſuch Objection, ſaid to it, that theſe ſubordinate Councils (granted in themſelves fallible) did not denounce ſuch *Anathemas*, nor require aſſent to their decrees but with relation to the ſame Infallibility reſiding in the *General Body* of Church-Governours, and their concurrence therein: that they paſſed not ſuch Acts without conſulting the Tradition and Judgment of *other Churches*, and eſpecially of the *Apoſtolick See*: To this he replies,——*That the* Anathemas *of Provincial Councils did not relate to the acceptation of their decrees either by the Pope, or the whole Church, as* N.O. *ſuppoſes, but did proceed upon their own aſſurance of the truth of what they decreed, otherwiſe their* Anathemas *would have been only conditional, and not abſolute and peremptory, as we ſee they were.* Laſtly, *That he needs to give no other anſwer to this argument, than in the words of Dr.* Field ||——*That Councils denounce* Anathema, *not becauſe they think every one that diſobeys the decree of the Council to be accurſed, but, becauſe they are perſwaded in particular that this is the eternal truth of God which they propoſe, therefore they accurſe them that obſtinatly ſhall reſiſt, as S.* Paul *willeth every Chriſtian man to* anathematize *an Angel coming from heaven, if he ſhall teach him any other doctrine than he hath already learned: yet is not every particular Chriſtian free from poſſibility of erring.* Thus the Doctor.

|| *Concil l.2. c.10.*

Conſid. p.40

|| *l.4.c.4.*

§. 65.

To which I return this; That, whereas the *Conceſſion* of Catholicks and particularly of *Bellarmine De Concil.* l.2. c.10. is produced as ruining this weak argument of *N.O.* that would prove from *anathematizing diſſenters Infallibility*; Firſt, here conſulting *Bellarmine* I find him, *De Concil.* l.2. c.3. where he maintains the Infallibility of General Councils, to urge (together with *N.O.*) this Argument for it, in theſe words:——2° *Docent Patres & Concilia eſſe Hereticos, & excommunicandos omnes, qui non acquieſcunt Conciliis plenariis. Ex quo manifeſtè ſequitur, eos putaſſe Concilia*

non posse errare: atque in primis omnia Concilia Generalia dicunt anathema contradicentibus, ut Athanasius testatur de Nicæno, &c. Next; That, for the Objection concerning *Provincial Councils* which *N.O.* well considered, he thought it sufficiently solved, (and so may think still) by those words of his before recited; and that *Bellarmine* also (because the Dr. quotes him) answers this Objection much-what in the same manner, saying——Provincial Councils have sometimes used such *anathema's* to dissenters in such points——*Quando res est facilis*: and this *facilis* he explains, *in quâ omnes ferè Doctores* [i.e. Ecclesiæ Catholicæ] *conveniunt*. [*Ferè*: for, it is not necessary that all should, no more than in the first four Councils they did]; *Et quando a Sede Apostolicâ confirmationem accipiunt*. [Which seems to say the same with *N.O.*; namely, when Provincial Councils have such a concurrence of the whole Church, as is sufficient to render their Act *equivalent* to that of a *Council General*; and so, in all necessaries infallible]. And therefore in the same place the Cardinal, instancing in the *Anathemas* passed in the African Councils against *Pelagianisme* observes out of *Prospers* Chronicon A.D. 420. that *Pelagianisme*, condemned by them, yet *non priùs ab Ecclesiâ totius orbis damnata est, quàm Zosimus Papa decreta illius Concilii firmasset*: *Prospers* words are, *---Concilio apud Carthaginem habito 217. Episcoporum ad Pontificem Zosimum synodalia decreta prolata sunt* [their Anathemas]; *quibus probatis per totum mundum Hæresis Pelagiana damnata est*, [and these Anathemas obtained their just force]. And that S. *Austin* in his Retractations‖ saith [not, *postquam Pelagiana hæresis a Conciliis Africanis*, but] *postquam ab Episcopis Ecclesiæ Romanæ, priùs Innocentio, deinde Zosimo, cooperantibus Conciliorum Africanorum literis* [i.e. relating to those Popes these their decrees] *convicta atq; damnata est*: though the African *Anathema's* were pronounced before the Pope's confirming their Acts; for which Confirmation we finde them writing to him, after their Council ended in this manner.——*Ut statuis nostra mediocritatis* (say they‖) *etiam Apostolicæ Sedis adhibeatur authoritas*, &c. who in his Answer to them also justifies them to consent with the whole Body of the Catholick Church. Thus then were their *Anathemas* grounded. To the Dr's Reply that follows, that in such a case their *Anathemas* would have been made only Conditional, I answer.

‖ l. 2. c. 50.

‖ *Apud August. Ep. 90.*

§. 66. That their *Anathemas*, though relating always to the general approbation of their Decrees, yet were penned not *Conditional*, but *Absolute*; either because such a sufficient concurrence with them of the Catholick Church was well known to them before the composing their Decree; as it may be, when yet the Confirmation

firmation of their Act is only received after it: Or, becauſe ſuch *Poſt*-Confirmation and Acceptation after the penning of the Decree, yet precedes the promulgation and juſt force or obligation of it; It being to run abſolute upon ſuch a conſent preſuppoſed; as it is the ordinary cuſtome in all Laws, the eſtabliſhment whereof depends on many ſucceſſively, yet in their firſt ſtile to run abſolutely, becauſe ſuch ratification is preſuppoſed to their having the due force of Laws. And ſo in *General Councils* the *Anathemas* are penned abſolute, though theſe Councils and their Decrees have not their full ſtrength till the Confirmation thereof by the *See Apoſtolick*, and alſo ſuch an admittance and acceptation of them by the Church Catholick Diffuſive (where the Repreſentatives of a Conſiderable part of it are abſent,) as is thought neceſſary †. Next, That, by the Dr's words of *the Anathemas of ſuch Councils proceeding upon their own aſſurance*, I know not what he means. Doth he allow *fallible Councils* upon a *perſwaſion* they have of the truth of what they decree, to *anathematize* diſſenters, and pronounce them Hereticks? Then, why may not the *Council of Trent* do ſo? Or, if he means by *their aſſurance*, that Provincial Councils are certain, without relation to any conſent of the whole, that they do not err in ſuch Decrees where they pronounce *Anathema*, ſo he ſeems to give to theſe Provincial Councils alſo an infallibility, more than which Catholicks do not deſire to be allowed to *General*; viz. the certainty that theſe Fathers met in a General Councils have, whether by the evidence of Scripture, or of Tradition, or of a neceſſary Conſequence from ſomething Traditional, or at leaſt of our Lord's promiſed Aſſiſtance, that they do not err in thoſe things they decree, though in many other things they be fallible.

† *Sec Bellarm. de Concil. l. 1. c. 17. §. 4. & l. 2. c. 11. §. objiciunt.*

To the Anſwer he makes out of *Dr. Field*, mentioned before, || and perplexed enough, I ſay, 1. That a Council cannot *juſtly* || §. 4. pronounce an *Anathema* on any, of whom ſome are thought by them not to deſerve it. 2. That it is clear, theſe Councils do not *anathematize obſtinate Reſiſters*, (whoſe obſtinacy may ly in contradicting) but any *Diſſenters*; inſerting alſo their Decrees ſometimes into the Creeds. 3. That no Council, only *perſwaded*, i.e. ſo as to have no doubt of the truth of what they propoſe (which full perſwaſion may well conſiſt with erring), and not *certain* and infallible therein, can *juſtly* require from others the belief of it; and *anathematize* diſſenters: Unleſs ſuch Judge perhaps knows, that none other can be certain of the contrary to his perſwaſion: or, that all others are commanded to follow his Judgment. Which things cannot be applied to Provincial Councils: and this Author maintains, that

§. 67.

that the power exacting an internal *assent* requires *infallibility*. This to *Dr. Field*, That a *full perswasion* is no just Ground for an *Anathema*.

§. 68. To that which follows out of *S. Paul*, I answer: That *S. Paul* or a *Galatian* must be not only perswaded, but *certain* of his not erring in that, for the meer dissent in which he can justly *anathematize* Angel, or Man; or esteem him as an *Anathema*. Nor may any one do this for any particular point in the Gospel, controverted, of the truth of which point he is perswaded only; nor yet in general for the truth of the Gospel it self, but as he is certain thereof; which all either are, or may be, from the certainty of *Tradition*; or the *Galatians*, to whom *S. Paul* writ, further, from *Miracles*.

§. 69. This to his *Replies*. But now the Reader may observe; that that to which the Dr. hath replyed is only a *piece* (divided from the rest) of what *N.O.* presseth; & to a principal part of his Plea no answer is returned. As, this he omits to speak to urged, by *N.O.* That General Councils have not only *Anathematized* Dissenters, but sometimes *inserted* their Decisions in the Church's *Creeds*, and so required an internal assent and belief of them, as of matters of necessary Faith. Again; Omits to answer to *N.O's* urging against him ‖ both Archbishop *Laud's*, and, sometimes, *his own*, asserting not only the Church in its *Being*, but *Teaching*, and in its General Councils, if these be universally *accepted*, to be infallible in all *Necessaries*; his asserting also, † That none can justly require an internal assent [as, I hope, the four first Councils did] but an authority that first proves it self infallible, where *N.O.* also objects, That Councils fallible, according to the tenents of Protestants, can justly require no more than an *external obedience*, or *silence* and *non-contradiction*. [From which it follows, that such Councils are infallible as do justly require more; as did the four first Councils with the voluntary acknowledgment also and submission of their Subjects to such an authority assumed by them]. To which I add; that therefore Protestants say; that the Church of *England* requires no more than this non-Contradiction to her 39. Articles: [for which Dr. *St.* ‖ quotes these words of Bishop *Bramhal*——*Neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them. By which* (faith Dr. *St.*) *we see what a vast difference there is between these things which are required by the Church of* England *in order to peace* [not belief] *and those which are imposed by the Church of* Rome. *as part of that faith, extra quam non est salus*]. And, Protestants on this account condemn the *Council of Trent*, that being a Council fallible yet it required more; and made

‖ *See before*, §. 57, 58.

† *See before*, §. 50.

‖ *Rat. Acc.* p. 55.

made, as they call it, a *new Creed*: but ſo, ſay I, muſt they condemn *the firſt four Councils* if not infallible. He omits this alſo urged, That the *whole Catholick* Church hath admitted the Decrees of Councils made in this ſtile; and held the Diſſenters from them *Hereticks*: where we have the judgment of the whole Church agreeing with that of General Councils concerning their Infallibiliſty in ſuch Decrees.

§. 70. Now, if neither *Anathematizing Diſſenters*, nor the Councils putting their Decrees in the Church's *Creeds*, nor the Church Catholick's afterward eſteeming thoſe *Hereticks* that diſſented from theſe Councils, are a ſufficient evidence or proof, that theſe Councils (& the Church alſo in accepting them) accounted them *infallible* in theſe their *Decrees*: I ask what could the moſt infallible Judge do, or exact more? Doth not the Dr. below † blame the Roman Church for aſſuming ſuch an *Infallibility to herſelf* [ſuch then it is in *Her*, though not in *General Councils*,] *in requiring ſuch a belief of her additional Articles defined in Trent, as of the moſt fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith*? And here, in what hath been urged out of him but now, doth not the Dr. grant the juſt requiring of an internal aſſent to inferr *Infallibility*? And ſo, muſt he not either hold the firſt Councils infallible, or that they unjuſtly required ſuch aſſent; unjuſtly put their Definitions in the Creeds; laſtly erroneouſly the Church diffuſive accepted of their Definitions, as ſuch, and eſteemed the contrary Tenents Hereſies againſt the faith? Muſt he not either hold, that theſe Councils knew not this he ſaith, that, unleſs infallible, they might not do ſuch things? or, elſe, took themſelves for infallible, when they were not? But, whom ſhall we believe herein? them, or the Dr rather? And, if holding themſelves fallible, why uſed they ſuch language, *In Spiritu Sancto congregati*? and, *Hæc eſt Fides Catholica*: relating partly to their own Definitions? And, after all, if fallible they were, what aſſurance hath any Chriſtian, that he hath not *erred* in his *Creed*? Can any one prepare a better Plea for the *Socinians*, than this man hath done? Or here, ſince, I hope, He will not, with Mr. *Chillingworth*, and againſt the judgment of the whole Catholick Church, deny, that the four firſt General Councils did theſe things juſtly, will he, deſerting his former opinion, juſtify the lawfulneſs of a Council, that grants it ſelf fallible in ſuch its decrees, notwithſtanding to do all theſe things? And, then, may not the Council of *Trent* rightly do ſo? And, laſtly, for what good reaſon then may the Church of *England* be ſaid to forbear the uſing ſuch authority? I ſay, a Solution of ſuch *difficulties* urged by *N. O.* I finde not in the Dr's Anſwers.

† *See p.* 182, 183.

Laſtly,

§. 71. Lastly, to the proof of the Church's Infallibility out of S. *Austin* mentioned before §. 54. he returns an answer extended from p. 250. to p. 260.

Where I find him p. 251. urging S. *Austins* words, that ——*In this matter we follow &c.*——*Sequimur sanè nos in hâc re* [i.e. in Non-Rebaptization:] *etiam Canonicarum authoritatem certissimam Scripturarum: and therefore that men might attain a certainty of the sense of Scripture in this matter without the Church's Infallibility* [to decide it]. Thus the Dr. But, this Father, every where consessing the difference about *Rebaptization* to be a most difficult and obscure Question, and not clearly resolved, as to all apprehensions, in the Scripture, speaks this *Sequimur sanè nos in hac re* &c. quite in another sense; namely, as he himself expounds it in the next words, when the *Donatists* urged to him there was no proof or example thereof in Scripture.——*Neque enim* (saith he) *parvi momenti habendum est quòd——hoc per universam Catholicam ecclesiam, quæ toto orbe diffunditur, observari placuit, quod tenemus,* Explicating himself yet in the words following much more, thus. ——*Quamvis hujus rei certè de Scripturis non proferatur exemplum earundem tamen Scripturarum in hâc re a nobis tenetur veritas cùm hoc facimus quod universa jam placuit Ecclesia, quam ipsarum Scripturarum commendat authoritas.* [*Commendat* : *i.e.* to be the true Church; and then both S. *Austin* and the *Donatist* were agreed, that the true Church must, or did, in this matter hold and state the truth.]——If this yet satisfy not, see the same said again elsewhere *De unitate Ecclesiæ* c. 22. where speaking of the non evidence concerning *Rebaptization* in Scripture——*Hoc apertè atque evidenter* [i.e. in the Scriptures, saith he] *nec ego lego, nec tu—— Nunc verò cùm in Scripturis non inveniamus* &c. *puto, si aliquis Sapiens extitisset, cui Dominus Jesus Christus testimonium perhibet; & de hâc Quæstione consuleretur a nobis, nullo modo deberemus dubitare id facere quod ille dixisset; ne non tam ipsi, quam Domino Jesu Christo, cujus testimonio commendatur, repugnare judicaremur. Perhibet autem testimonium Christus ecclesiæ suæ.* [*Testimonium*, that we should follow its judgment, *facere quod dicit*; otherwise a testimony to it concerning something else would have been nothing to S. *Austins* purpose. *Facere*, which is more than *non-contradicere*; and which implyes also *assentire verum esse, quod dicit.*] By all these passages we see the *certissima authoritas Scripturarum* is concerning the Church, which is it; *i.e.* the *Catholick* Church: and then, it discovered, is concerning the matter in Question also, as unerringly determined by it.

Again

Again p. 253. he urgeth out of S. *Austin*, ——*That, where the testimony of Scripture is very plain and clear, we are not to regard what* Donatus, *or* Parmenianus, *or* Pontius *hath said: for neither, saith he, are we to yield to Catholick Bishops themselves: if they be at any time so much deceived as to hold what is contrary to Canonical Scriptures. By which it is evident, that he supposed no Infallibility in the Guides of the Church.* All which *N.O.* grants very true, if understood as the Father speaks it: of *particular Doctors* of the Catholick Church, not of its *General Councils*. Nor can one rationally plead the sense of Scriptures plain and clear on his side, where a General Council understands and expounds them contrary. §. 72.

Ibid. He urgeth as S. *Austins* words——*That the* [true] *Church is to be proved* [and so the Dr would have it understood of other Controversies] *by nothing but plain Scriptures; neither by the authority of* Optatus, or *S.* Ambrose, *or innumerable Bishops, nor Councils, nor Miracles* &c. But such words are not S. *Austin's*; Nor doth he affirm that, *which is the true Church*, can be proved by nothing but Scriptures; for, himself saith elsewhere, that he came to know the *Scriptures* from the *Church*, first known to him; and the *Church* by *Miracles*: Nor speaks he here any thing derogatory to General Councils, or the authority or infallibility of them: (of which see more in the Annotation on p. 251. *l.* 8. *from the bott.*) But, the Donatists with him allowing the *Scriptures*, he urgeth the Church sufficiently demonstrable by their clear authority; which, if clear, alone also sufficeth; and therefore requires of them, that, he waving these other proofs, *viz.*: of *Councils*, *Miracles*, &c on his side, wherein he had much the advantage of them by *Episcopi innumerabiles* and *Miracula vera*, so they would wave the urging of their Councils far *inferiour*, and their Miracles, Visions, &c *fallacia*, on their side (which Arguments of theirs he calls *murarum tendicula*); and that they should press Scriptures again. Scriptures. But, if the Judgment of *General Councils* was denied by him to be any proof in Controversies, why used he it as such, in *Rebaptization*? §. 73.

Again, p. 254. he saith,——*That all the proofs S. Austin brings for the Church, relate to the Universality of it, not to the Infallibility.* Where it is true, that, as to the Donatist, the *Universality of the Church* was all the matter in controversy: both sides being fully agreed, that that was the *Truth* in the Controversy of *Rebaptization* which the true Church, which-soever it were, held and taught. Otherwise, from the Church determining in its General Council this point of Rebaptization, S. *Austin* could not have urged its determining a *truth*, as he every where doth (see §. 74.

the quotations in Note on p. 251. *l.* 8. *from the bott.* and the Donatists would soon have replied, that *his* General Council erred, and that S. *Cyprian's* was in the right.

§. 75. Again; p. 255. he produceth that much-worn place of S. *Austin*——*Concilia plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari.* The Reader may view the place set down at large there by this Author; p. 256. *which words of S.* Austin, *he afterward presseth, cannot be understood of unlawful Councils, of matters of fact or practice, but do refer to the great Question then in debate about Rebaptizing Hereticks*; And,——*that hereby S.* Austin *takes off the great Plea the* Donatists *made from the authority of S.* Cyprian *and his Council, which they continually urged for themselves.* But *N.O.* had already || *Addit. to* p. 86 *l.* 11. weighed this Common-place, and replied to it, ||——*That, if such Plenary Councils, as that which determined* Non-Rebaptization, *were errable, and amendable, in these* Dogmata fidei, *neither had S.* Austin *any reason, to presume* (*as he doth Ibid. c.* 4.) *that S.* Cyprian *would have corrected his opinion concerning this* Point: *or, to charge the* Donatists *with Heresy, for dissenting from it, after the Determination of such a Council: Nor had the* 2*d. General Council any just ground to put it in the Creed* [Credo unum Baptisma in remissionem peccatorum]. *No just cause I say to do any such thing, if* Plenaria Concilia, *taken in their highest capacity, are in their stating matters of faith errable and amendable by others following.* Thus *N.O.*: to which the Reader may search what answer he finds returned by this Respondent in so copious a Reply.

§. 76. Whatever the sense therefore of this place be, of which see more in the *Annotations* on p. 255. *l.* 10. *from the bott.* it cannot be understood of *lawful* General Councils amending one another, as to any matters of *necessary* faith; that such Councils, when defining any thing to be by all Christians believed and assented-to, when declaring Hereticks all that dissent, and perhaps inserting such their Definition into the Creed, yet may be *amended* afterward in this by other latter Councils. For, this would overthrow the old foundations of the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creed; and whatever can be discovered of *one* such Council thus erring may well be applyed to *any* other. This also would overthrow particularly S. *Austins Veritas eliquata & declarata*; And——*plenarium Concilium confirmavit & consolidavit*, for Non-Rebaptization (the chief, if not the only Argument he useth for convincing the *Donatist* in this point,) whilst they might here plead, somthing was still *latens and clausum*, till more experience in a latter Council should open and disclose it: and so must all, before cited out of S. *Austin*, be also reverted; and all the former Heresies revive again,

gain, which, when pretending *Scriptures* for their Tenents, have been quelled by the judgment of such *Councils*.

§. 77. Whether then, that by *emendari* is meant not as to *dogmata fidei*, but in some other matters, wherein the Higher Councils, by being ignorant of some circumstances &c, are liable to errour: Or, that by *Plenaria* (which seems the most probable) are meant such Councils as were, *of the Arians*, many before S. *Austin's* time, but there in several manners irregular and uncanonical, that were amended by others following, as by the 2d. General Council of *Constantinople*, and by that of *Sardica*, as also S. *Austin*, elsewhere, particularly instanceth in that of *Ariminum*, called a *Plenary* Council (but wherein the *Arian* Party unjustly prevailed with the Emperour and falsifyed the sense of its Decrees) *amended* afterward by the Councils and the Church's Judgment in the times following. See lib. *Contra Maximinum*. 3. c. 14. There ——*Homousion* (saith he) *multis paucorum fraude deceptis, haretica impietas sub Haretico Imperatore labefactare capit, sed post non longum tempus libertate fidei Catholicæ prevalente——Homousion illud Catholicæ fidei sanitate*] [*i.e.* in the *Constantinopolitan* and *Sardinican* Council.] *longè lateque defensum est* [*defensum* not against the Decree of a former *plenary* Council, but the misinterpretation and tyranny of a *minor*, but then *prevalent*, Party in it, *sub Haretico Imperatore*]; I say in whichsoever, of the forenamed wayes this passage may be understood, (as probably it is to be so, in the latter) this is certain that it cannot be understood of Lawful General Councils amending one another, as to any matters of necessary Faith, for the reasons but now given. Besides the proving of nothing less to them than that Non-rebaptization was a truth could satisfy the *Donatist*; or invalidate the judgment of the *African Council* under *Cyprian*, as to its determining the *Truth*. The Dr also saying here, that S. *Austin* urgeth this *Plenaria prior a posterioribus emendari to take off the great plea the* Donatists *made from the authority of* S Cyprian *and his Council*, which Council of *Cyprian* was not *Plenarium ex universo orbe Christiano*, shews, that S. *Austin* needed not, for confuting them, to take *Plenarium* in any higher sense than that of S. *Cyprian's*. Whereas taking *Plenaria* in the largest sense and without any limitations will make nothing at all *for* the *Father* in his present controversy with the *Donatist* about *Rebaptization*: Nay, more *against* him. For, there were no two such Councils, that were both *General*, whereof the latter had amended the former concerning Rebaptization at all: and, had there, the same uncertainty of truth would have been in the Decree of the latter, as of the former; and in this case the

Donatiſt would not have failed to have taken the advantage of the former Council. Theſe things, I hope, the equal Reader will conſider (though the Dr hath not); and will not admit ſuch a ſenſe of this place as, if true, *contradicts* what S. *Auſtin* ſaith ſo often elſewhere, and quite ruines this Father's *Plea*, and *Cauſe*.

§. 78. Pag. 256. 257. I find ſeveral places produced, wherein S. *Auſtin* preferrs clear *Scriptures* before *humane*, though never ſo learned, *authority* varying from them; but find in him no compariſon, or oppoſition, between theſe and the Judgment of a *General Council* as running counter to one another. How could this be, when in the Controverſy, for which he urgeth Scripture, he requireth the Donatiſts to ſubmit to the expoſition of the Council?

§. 79. Ibid. He ſaith—*The utmoſt by a careful conſideration of S.* Auſtin's *mind in this matter that I can find is; that, in a Queſtion of ſo doubtful and obſcure a nature as that of Rebaptization was, it was a reaſonable thing to preſume, that what the whole Chriſtian world did conſent in was the truth, not upon the account of Infallibility but the reaſonable ſuppoſition, that all the Churches of the Chriſtian World would not conſent in a thing repugnant to any Apoſtolical doctrine or Tradition.* But *N.O.* preſſeth that S. *Auſtin's* mind was clearly otherwiſe; not that it was only *a reaſonable thing to preſume*, but a thing moſt certain, that what the whole Chriſtian world did conſent in, was the *Truth*, as appears in thoſe places cited before §. 55. and. 71. elſe it could not be true what he *ſaith*—*Earundem Scripturarum etiam in hâc re* [i. e. in Non-rebaptization] *tenetur veritas, cùm id facimus quod univerſæ placuit Eccleſiæ*, if the Church may poſſibly decide it amiſs. And S. *Auſtin's*—*Siquis falli metuit hujus obſcuritate queſtionis Eccleſiam de illâ conſulat* would no way relieve his being deceived ſtill, if the Church conſulted might alſo be miſtaken in it. Nor, eſpecially, ſuch Article, only upon a reaſonable ſuppoſition that they erred not in it, be inſerted in the Creed. Before that the Dr therefore ſhould have concluded ſuch to have been S. *Auſtin's* mind, he ſhould, in anſwering theſe things alledged by *N.O.* have ſhewed ſuch his *mind* to have agreed with his *words*.

Conſid. p. 86

§. 80. Laſtly, he concludes thus p. 259—*In ſuch a caſe as this, I agree to what S.* Auguſtine *ſaith, and think a man very much relieved by following ſo evident a conſent of the Univerſal Church: not by vertue of any Infallibility, but the unreaſonableneſs of believing, ſo many, ſo wiſe, ſo diſintereſſed perſons ſhould be deceived.*

Though *N.O.* hath ſhewed S. *Auſtin* requiring ſubmiſſion of the *Donatiſts* upon the General Council's determining a moſt certain truth;

truth; Yet this were ſomewhat *well*, (if this Author or Proteſtants would generally ſtand to it), that private men ſhould follow ſuch an evident conſent of the Univerſal Church on this account; viz: *the unreaſonableneſs of the believing, that ſo many, ſo wiſe, ſo diſintereſſed perſons ſhould be deceived.* But, I am afraid the Dr, if put to *follow* conſtantly ſuch a *conſent* will relieve himſelf here with a clauſe that lies dormant, and which his Reader perhaps takes litle notice of; viz. *in ſuch a caſe as this*; i.e. a caſe doubtful, and difficult. Yet, one would think, if we have reaſon to follow theſe wiſe men's judgment in things that are *difficult*, and that have little evidence, and light in Scripture, (as Rebaptization was), much more have we reaſon to follow it in ſuch things ſtill, as are more *clear* in Scripture; ſince this is more incredible, that *ſo many*, ſo *wiſe*, ſo *diſintereſſed* perſons ſhould be *deceived* in them: Or that, That is there clear to us, which is not ſo to them; but the contrary. And ſo I take leave of the Dr's Anſwer, to return again to the progreſs of *N.O's* Diſcourſe.

CHAP. V.

Concerning Sects and Hereſies not ſuppreſſible without an Eccleſiaſtical Judge.

V. Fifthly *N.O.* much preſſeth againſt ſuch Principle: 1ſt. that the remitting thus all manner of perſons, for the underſtanding of all points neceſſary to ſalvation Scripture, as aſſerted clear therein, only they uſing a due endeavour, without requiring any ſubmiſſion of their judgment, or of aſſent in ſuch matters to the Definitions of the Church, as pretended in theſe not infallible, is a Plea no more juſtifying the *Reformation*, and the *diſſent* from *ſuperiors*, of the *Church* of *England*, than that of any *other Sect* whatever, even of thoſe which the ſame Church of *England* moſt abhorrs: For that all theſe Sects alſo, for the Doctrines and Extravagancies they maintain, and Diſceſſions they make, do equally appeal to the Clearneſs of the Infallible *Scriptures*, in them, ſufficiently intelligible unto their ſincere endeavours, and decline as fallible, all other *Eccleſiaſtical Authority*. §. 81. *Conſid.* p. 97.

So *Volkelius* † pleads for the *Socinians* (as the Dr. for the Church of *England*)——*Qua de fide in Chriſtum ſtatuenda ſunt ex Sacris Literis petere.* And again——*Deum, qui religionem Chriſtianam uſque ad mundi finem vigere voluit, eatenus etiam tale aliquid perpetuo* §. 82. † *Volkel. de vera Relig. l.* 5. *c.* 7.

UMI

perpetuo extare, *unde ea, quatenus omninò ad ſalutem eſt neceſſarium, cognoſci indubitatè poſſit. At nihil talo extare, præter* Sacras Literas. To the ſame purpoſe *Crellius* another *Socinian* ſaith—*Hæc Sententia* [by which Chriſt's Divinity is denied] *plurimis ac clariſſimis Sacrarum Literarum teſtimoniis nititur.* It is needleſs to cite more. From whence is manifeſt: That ſuch *Principles*, as here appear only in the defence of the Religion eſtabliſhed in the Church of *England*, make the ſame Apology alſo for all thoſe other *Proteſtant parties*, and for the moſt blaſphemous Sects diſclaimed by it: The Dr in the mean while omitting *that*, by which the former learned Defenders of his Church uſually have juſtified it againſt them; namely the Church of *England's* adhering to the *Traditional* Expoſition and ſenſe of Scripture received from the *Primitive* Church: This, I ſay, he omitts, perhaps, becauſe it may be thought to reliſh a little of Church-Infallibility.

Crell. de uno Deo Patre in Præfat.

Conſid. p. 98

§. 83.

2ly. Neither doth ſuch *Principle* leave any juſt and ſufficient means, in ſuch Church as maintains it, of ſuppreſſing any *Sect*, *Schiſm* or *Hereſy*; By *Sects* here I do not mean any Parties, that are of different opinions in matters not determined or ſtated on any ſide by the Church, or thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Superiors to whom they owe Obedience; but ſuch, as diſſent from and refuſe conformity to her *eſtabliſhed Doctrines* and Injunctions. And, *by ſuppreſſing them*, I mean preſerving the Church perpetually in its integrity and unity of faith, by *excluding* all ſuch, if otherwiſe uncorrigible, from her Communion; and purging herſelf from ſuch a leaven and contagion. For which effect our Lord hath left a perpetual Authority to his Church, in her General Councils, equally taking upon her in all ages to judge what is *Hereſy*, or *Schiſme* and who *Sectaries*; and requiring a ſtrict *aſſent* to her Definitions in matters of faith; and removing ſuch as do not ſo ſubmit out of her Society by Excommunication, according to our Lord's—*Si Eccleſiam non audierit ſit tibi ſicut Ethnicus*; and S. *Paul's*—*Hæreticum hominem, poſt unam & ſecundam correptionem devita*—*Devita profanas*—And—*Etiamſi abſcindantur, qui vos conturbant*

Conſid. p. 98

Tit. 3. 10.

Gal. 5. 12.

By which he preſerves herſelf *Unam, Sanctam, Catholicam*; one Body, and not only of one *language* by the *ſilence* and non-contradiction of any of her members; but, by *ſpeaking* alſo, of one *mind*, and one faith, and without any rent or *ſchiſme*, all the Parts of this Body (as hath been ſaid before §. 26.) being placed in an exact ſubordination; by which it is well known, in any diviſion and diſſent of theſe Governours, to whom Obedience is due. [By Obedience of *All* &c. I ſay, preſerved of one mind; for, though a General Non Contradiction to any of the Church's profeſſed

proſeſſed doctrines may poſſibly procure the Church's peace and prevent the ſpreading and contagion of ſuch Hereſies, and Sects, where ſuch an Obedience is ſtrictly obſerved; Yet 1it. So long as no *ſubmiſſion* of *Judgment* is required, Hereſy is neither at all prevented in, or ejected out of, the Church, if any of her Members be ſtained therwith, but only *ſilenced*. 2ly Where there is a diſſent *in Judgment*, it is almoſt impoſſible that none alſo ſhall appear in *diſcourſe* or *writings*: for, *out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth* will be *ſpeaking*. 3ly. If the obedience of a *Non-contradiction* ſufficiently ſecures the Church's Peace, Yet Proteſtants, upon their ground of Church-fallibility in Neceſſaries, cannot Univerſally allow or admit ſuch an obedience; becauſe ſo there could never have been any *Reformation* of ſuch Church her *Errours*, though never ſo groſſe and fundamental, where no lawful gainſaying or contradicting them, either by *Laicks* or eſpecially by the Clergy.]. The Church then, by requiring ſuch ſubmiſſion of Judgment, and removing diſſenters, preſerves her ſubjects for ever, not only of *one Language*, but of *one Mind*, in the common faith. But, according to this Principle of the Dr's which leaves all perſons, (upon the ſecuring them if uſing a juſt diligence they cannot err in neceſſaries), to their own judgment, as to their *aſſent* to, or *diſſent* from, what the Church determines; (which Aſſent is maintained by him not to be juſtly required, as to matters of Faith, by any Judges, ſave the infallible) here can be no juſt *excluding* any diſſenters from ſuch Church's *communion*: and ſo all Sects, and opinions equally remain, if they pleaſe, in it. Or, in their ſeparating one from another, (as an *Union* of *Charity* and peace laſts not long, where is once a *diverſity* of Opinion, or *Faith*) there is no means left here, upon ſuch a ground, for reducing any to the ſentiments of the reſt, though in thoſe *points* which are of the greateſt *moment*. For, when two contradicting parties, (after both repairing to the Scriptures and ſuppoſing a due endeavour uſed to underſtand them,) do contend Scripture clear for themſelves, the *clearneſs* of ſuch *Scripture* how great ſoever it be on one ſide, & how falſly ſoever pretended or imagined on the other, cannot be made an *inſtrument* of *conviction* to the other: here then can be no ſuppreſſion of any ſide, nor abſciſſion of them from the Catholick Communion, how pernicious ſoever their doctrine be, unleſs things be proſecuted further than Scripture, to their *hearing the Church*, that is *aſſenting* and ſubmitting to its judgment; or elſe being eſteemed and treated as *Heathens*. Matt. 18. 17. Now the Church, here referred to by our Lord in caſe of differences, is not ſo proper an Arbitrator, and

Judge

Judge of any contentions, as of those that happen in the matter of the *Christian Faith*; (in which matter also we see S. *Paul*, *Timothy*, and *Titus* used their *Ecclesiastical Authority* and *Judicature*): and therefore they seem to do much wrong to this Text, who would limit it especially, if not only, to trespasses in Manners.

§. 84. n. 1. 3ly. *N.O.* adds also that the great *licentiousness* of opinions that follows upon such a *Principle* seems very contrary also to the former *pretences* and *practice* of the *Church* of *England* for which he urgeth, *Consid* p. 77.* the Title of the 39. Articles which are said to be——*Agreed upon for the avoiding of diversities of opinions and the establishing of* Consent *touching true Religion*: And * 5. *Canon Synod* 1602.——*Whosoever shall affirm these Articles agreed on for establishing Consent in true Religion such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe* [i.e. assent] *unto, let him be excommunicated, and not restored, but after repentance, and revocation of such his wicked* [not, gainsaying, or contradiction, but] *Errour*: and * *Can.* 36.——*Where the Clergy are obliged——To allow and acknowledg all the Articles agreeable to God's Word* [i.e. to assent to them]: and the * *Statute* 13. *Eliz.* c. 12. Where such as enter into the Ministry are required——*to declare their assent and subscribe to the* 39. *Articles of Religion* [this being there added also] *which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and doctrine of the Sacraments: Entitled Articles whereupon it was agreed* &c. *and shall have from the Bishop a testimonial of such assent and subscription* &c. (Of which matter the Reader, if he pleaseth may see much more in the 3d *Disc. concerning the Guide in Controversy* ch. 7.).

Preface p. 6. —& *Consid.* p. 77.

§. 84. n. 2. *N.O.* also contends *Ibid.* against the Dr's 26th *Principle*, That the Church of *England's* rejecting in her Articles several points believed in the Church of *Rome* as contrary to Scripture (as she doth *Purgatory*, *Adoration* of *Images*, *Invocation* of *Saints*, Article of the Church of *England* 22 *Works* of *Supererogation* Art. 14. *Sacrifice* of the *Mass* Art. 31. *Transubstantiation*. Art. 28.) is as plainly making the *Negatives* of these Articles of her Faith, as the Roman Church doth the *Positives*, and using the same severity herself, which she complains of in others. Because the declaring any Positive proposition to be contrary to Scripture makes the *Negative* thereof to be a thing *revealed* in Scripture, and therefore this to be believed by all, who hold it is so. Thus, though, if I profess not to believe *Transubstantiation* because neither contained in Scripture, nor deducible thence, I do not hereby make the denial or *Negative* thereof an Article of my Faith; Yet, if I profess not to believe it, because *contrary* to Scripture, I do.

Now,

Now, in all these things, this Church seems to have an aim at the preservation of an *Unity* of *Faith* and opinion amongst her subjects, and a removing from her Communion of such as shall not *assent* to her Doctrines, and acquiesce in her Ceremonies. And, (I know not whether by some later different Comments on the sense of these her Canons and Laws, but) so it is, that since *Chillingworths* times, who seems the first that made this Principle more current and authentick in this Church, Sects have much more multiplyed in this Nation, than formerly. And——*By this way* N.O. saith, || *our later English Divines seem to have brought the Authority of their Church into a great disreputation and waning condition, and to have excused, yea justified all Sects which have or shall separate from her,* [i.e. as to the liberty they take of such a separation]. *For, indeed what fault can it be to forsake, when they imagine the contrary to be truth, the doctrine of a Church, whose teaching none is bound to believe or obey out of conscience?* || *Consid. Pref. p. 7.*

4 But *N.O.* yet further observes, that, though the Church of *England* should or also doth require *assent* and submission of judgment from her Subjects to her *Decrees* and *Articles* of *Religion* for hindring Sects and divisions from her, yet that she cannot justify to her subjects any such proceedings, nor justly restrain them from doing toward her that, which she indulged her self, in the *Reformation* toward her *Superiours*. So that if, in some cases, viz. in what not indeed were, but seemed to her, *manifest* and *intolerable* errours, she might depart from and publickly oppose the doctrine of Church-Councils superiour to her National one, so might others again break off and reform from her on the like to them-seeming good grounds and causes. Such submission *of assent* being, by no particular Church divided from the more Universal, with the least pretence of reason to be challenged from her subjects, when she her self, (and particularly the Church of *England*,) refused the same to all the Superiour Church-Authority that was extant when she departed: as surely there was and is always an Authority Superiour, to a *Primate*, as to *Persons*; or, as for *Councils*, to a *National* one. §. 85. *Pref. p. 5.*

Now, to consider the Dr's Replies to these things.

To *N.O's* pressing here, that he seems in his *Principles* to discede from the intentions of the Church of *England*, which in several passages || requires an *Assent* from her Subjects to the verity of her Articles of Religion, and conformity to her Ceremonies which implyes *Assent*, I do not remember he hath said any thing; Yet a Point that, if it were but for the *Presbyterians* sake who boggle much at such a submission, needs some clearing. Nor hath §. 86. || *See before*, §. 84.

he said any thing in Answer to the Church of *England's* being
|| §.84 *n.*2. shewed || to make the *Negatives*, Articles of her faith; whilst she condemns the tyranny of the *Roman* Church in making the *Positives* so.

§.87. *Prefa.p.*7. Next; to *N.O's*, words—That, by their way, the late English Divines have excused yea justified all the Sects which have or shall separate from their Church; which *N.O.* speaks not of their justifying these Sects universally in whatever they hold or do; or, what being practised in the Church of *England*, they take offence at, but only, of justifying the liberty they take in disceding in their Opinions, as they see fit, from the Doctrines and Principles of this Church, (so limited by *N.O.* both in the precedent and following words); whilst these Late men also tell them, that they may safely follow their own judgment, at least as to all *necessaries* for their *salvation*; wherein they cannot erre, if using a sincere endeavour to understand the Holy Scripture; which is in all such points clear. In answer to this, this Author from p. 180. &c. to p. 186. undertakes to shew—*That there is a different case of the separation of Dissenters from the Church of* England, *and of Her separation from the Church of Rome*, shewing several Reasons or Motives of the Church of *Englands* departing from the Roman Church, which the sects (being of the same opinion in them) have not, of departing from her: But this thing is willingly granted him before-hand; that differences herein he may shew many, that no way concern *N.O's* discourse, who chargeth him and others only with this; that, from their teaching, that none do owe a submission of judgment to that of their Ecclesiastical Superiors, every one may rightly collect, that he may follow his own; Or; that, if *You* may depart from your Superiours, Persons, or Councils, upon a just cause; of which cause, you say, it is all reason that you, not your Superiours, judge: then, so may *They* from you, upon any cause also they think just; Or; that, if there be no decisive Judge, for differences between you and your Superiours, to whose sentence you can be obliged; so neither is there, for differences between them and you: and that, as you appeal from your Ecclesiastical Superiours to Evidence of Scripture, so seeming to you, in your cause; so may they from you, in their's. For, I suppose here, the Dr will both acknowledge [1] Some *Councils* to be superiour to a *National* one; and some *Ecclesiastical Persons* to a *Primate*; And [2] that these Ecclesiastical Superiours, fallible, when proceeding against *Evidence* of *Scriptures*, may be therein relinquished. And This is the thing wherein *N.O.* affirms you to countenance and warrant the proceedings of all these *Sects*.

1. First

1. Print then, to shew these *Differences*, he saith p. 181. §.88.
Here lies a very considerable difference, that we appeal and are ready to stand to the judgment of the Primitive Church for interpreting the letter of Scripture in any difference between us and the Church of Rome; but those who separate from our Church will allow nothing to be lawful, but what hath an express command in Scripture. To which I say: That, this difference supposed or granted here (of which see more in the *Annotations* ‖) notwithstanding he will be found ‖ *On p.* 181.
still to justify the *Sectaries* in their departure from the present *Church* of *England*, as she did the present Church that was before *Luther*, which, as the Dr maintains, she might do, upon a *just cause*, that is appearing so to Her from the evidence of the Scripture; so say the *Sectaries*, they may, and do from her, upon a *just cause*: but I need not say, the same Cause. And, as he holdeth, that this *Church* owed no submission of judgment to the definitions of that Church's former *Councils*, being fallible; so neither, say, the *Sects*, do they to the *National* Synods of this. But, if the judgment of such matters be removed from these latter, to the *Primitive* times, & to *Antiquity*; This, is taken *ad libitum* in a several latitude, is a *Precedent* all Parties pretend to; and is a Judge, the *sense* of whose sentence all parties may dispute, as they do that of Scripture, without matters coming hereby to any strict Decision. Neither will the *Presbyterians* I believe, abandon this Hold to the *Dr*; and his *Irenicum* perhaps will help them to maintain it. And, for some such reason it may be, that he here, in comparing the *Church* of *England* and the *Sects*, declines the *direct* Antithesis, of *their deserting*, or renouncing contrary to Her Owning or adhering to, these *Primitive* Times: As the ingenuous Reader may observe.

2ly. P. 182. He saith——*The Guides of our Church never challenged any infallibility to themselves, which those of the Church of* Rome *do.* [He should have said—— Which the *Catholick Church* in her lawful General Councils doth]. Now from this may well be gathered, that the Dissenters from the Church of *England* depart in their judgment from a pretended, not infallible, but, *fallible*, Church. And I ask, What advantage hence, for confuting what is said by *N.O*? Doth not this fallibility of the Church of *England* in her *Doctrines*, confessed, secure any to depart from them and her, as they shall think fit, without being justly for this called to an account by her? And are not all *Sects* hereby justified in following the perswasion of their own judgment against hers; as she also following hers against her Superiours, because fallible? He saith also there,——*That the Church of* England *declares in her* §.89.

Articles, that all the proof of things to be believed is to be taken from Holy Scripture. She may declare ſo, & yet the *Sectariſts* not therefore admit, that all, that Holy Scriptures are alledged for by the Church of *England*, is to be believed; ſince theſe differ, in the *ſenſe* of ſeveral places of *Scripture*, from this *Church*, and ſo, as to theſe, may depart from her *Judgment*.

§. 90. 3ly. He ſaith P. 183.——*That the Church of* Rome *makes the belief of her doctrines neceſſary to ſalvation.*——*But nothing of this nature can be objected againſt the Church of* England *by diſſenters, that excludes none from a poſſibility of ſalvation meerly becauſe not in her Communion.* To this I ſay, as I did to the laſt; The *leſſer neceſſary* the Church of *England* makes the belief of her *Doctrines*, the more liberty ſtill the Sects will think they have of *diſſenting* from them. But, changing here the Dr's *Roman* (of which *N.O.* ſaid nothing) into the *Catholick Church*, headed by her General Councils, ſhe freely tells thoſe who dare depart from her, that there is no *Salvation* to thoſe out of her *Communion*; and that their *Conſcience* mis-perſwaded doth *oblige* indeed, but not therefore *excuſe*, them. And this cauſeth thoſe, who are careful of their ſalvation, and believe her in this, to ſecure themſelves in her Communion.

§. 91. 4ly. P. 184. He ſaith——*The Guides of the Roman Church pretend to an immediate authority of obliging the conſciences of men* [i.e, as I underſtand him, affirm that their Subjects are obliged in conſcience to yield an aſſent and ſubmiſſion of judgment to their definitions and decrees: which is true, changing *Roman* into *Catholick*,] *But* (ſaith he) *ours challenge no more than Teaching men to do, what Chriſt had commanded them.* Means he not this here of the Church of *England* in oppoſition to the *Roman obliging mens conſciences*; that it only teacheth ſuch things; but challengeth not any abſolute obedience or *belief* from its *Subjects*, that Chriſt hath commanded ſuch things as it teacheth? If ſo: Doth not this ſtill ſpur on the *Sects* to caſt about for themſelves; ſince this *Church* may tell them, Chriſt hath commanded them, what indeed he hath not? and ſince this Author tells them moreover, that the *Scriptures*, read by them with a ſincere endeavour to underſtand them, will be *clear* to them in neceſſaries?

§. 92. 5ly. P. 185. He ſaith——*The reaſons we plead for ſeparation from the Church of* Rome *are in themſelves far more conſiderable than thoſe which are pleaded by ſuch who ſeparate from our Church.* And——*That our Church's impoſing of three Ceremonies, declared to be indifferent by thoſe who require them, cannot be thought by any men of common ſenſe ſo great a burden to their conſciences, as all the load of ſuperſtitious fopperies in the Roman Church.* To this I ſay: Be it

it a less or a greater load that is laid upon us, both *oppress* us, where neither can be born. *Ceremonies* (he saith) *declared to be indifferent, by those who require them.* But, what if not, by the Dissenters, believed to be *indifferent*, as a fallible Church tells them? May these be imposed upon them so as to require *conformity* in the practice, which includes assent to the *lawfulness*, thereof? Or, if the departure of the Church of *England* from *Rome*, for *many things* imposed, for the preserving her *Conscience* otherwise perswaded, is justified; why not the departure of these Dissenters from the Church of *England*, though for *fewer things* imposed, justified here also? And can *this Author* blame them therein? And saith he not to this purpose in the beginning of this Answer || *That the perswasion of conscience equally serves to all Parties?* || p.180.

From all these instances he would collect; that the *Sectarists* have less reason to depart from the *Church* of *England* than she hath, from *Rome*; which is true as to *these matters* whilst the sects are of the same Judgment with her therein; therefore also for none of these do they depart from her. But yet, for other matters they may and do, wherein they think her faulty and defective: and do this, according to the *Grounds* of a *lawful departure*, which they have learnt from her; and the Example, which she hath formerly given them in her separation from her Superiours. [Which matter having been shewed at large in the 4th *Discourse Concerning the Guide in Controversies*, I may save this labour, and referr the Reader to it. Where, for an *Instance*, the *Socinian* draws up his Plea, proceeding on the *Protestants* Principles and Concessions, and particularly those of this *Dr* (which there are frequently cited by him), that in his Tenents concerning the Trinity he holds nothing either repugnant to the *Holy Scripture*, i.e. rightly understood; or to the *unanimous sense of Antiquity*, or *Definitions of lawful General Councils*, so far as these two are admitted by *Protestants* to oblige. Nor that he stands guilty either of *Heresy*; or of *Schisme*; i.e. according as *Protestants* state them.] And also, in all these Replies here of the Dr, let the Reader consider, Whether *N.O's* Objection is not rather more fortified by what he pretendeth to dissolve it?

Lastly; to *N.O's* urging †, That such *Principles* leave no just and sufficient means, in such a Church as maintains them, of suppressing *Sects*, *Schismes*, or *Heresies*, He returns an answer from p. 286. to the end of his Discourse to which he gives this *Title* in his *Contents*, *The Roman Church's way of suppressing Sects compared with our's.* Where I find him, p. 287. &c. very bitterly inveighing

§. 99.

† *See before*, §.83.

inveighing againſt the *Roman Inquiſition*, and ſpending the moſt of his Reply upon it. Which *Inquiſition*, as uſed in *ſome* Catholick Churches, ſo is not admitted *in others*; and which, no way mentioned in the Dr's *Principles*, or in *N. O's Conſiderations*, I wondred how he brought it into his Anſwer, or why he ſpent ſo many pages upon it; but at laſt I conſidered, it might be much to *his purpoſe*, as a thing which to his Proteſtant Reader would ſeem odious, though it be nothing to *N.O's diſcourſe*; who preſſeth not the Roman *Inquiſition* but the *Catholick Church* in her *Councils*, requiring Aſſent to her Definitions, pronouncing the Diſſenters Hereticks, and expelling them from her Communion, and ſo preſerving among the Subjects of this Body the ſame *Faith* and *Unity*, at leaſt proportionable to the extent of her laws and decrees: of which *means* of ſuppreſſing *Sects* and *Hereſies*, or any other that can be effectual, the Dr, in diſſallowing ſuch *practice*, and leaving every one to the liberty of their own judgment in the matters moſt neceſſary to their ſalvation, ſeems deſtitute.

§. 94. Again I find him p. 289. ſaying——*That, ſetting the Inquiſition aſide, the Church of* England *hath as many reaſonable means, and I think many more of convicting diſſenters, than they can pretend to in the Roman Church.* But, expecting he ſhould name theſe || p. 290. means, he ſaith ||——*We recommend to the people the vertues of Humility, Obedience*, due ſubmiſſion *to their Spiritual Paſtors and Governours, and that they ought not to uſurp their office, and become their own Guides——Yet we do not exact of them a blinde obedience*, &c. Thus he. But, if the Church of *England* doth only this, and no more, it is a *means* apparently *inſufficient* for ſuppreſſing Hereſies or Sects. For, men are ſtill left to the liberty of their former tenents or practices, ſo long as the contraries are (in his ſtile) only *recommended to* them, not *required of* them; and *Counſel* is no *Power* of the *Keys*. The Recommending of a *due* ſubmiſſion to our Spiritual Paſtors will not ſerve the turn, if this *due* be not ſtated, and underſtood to extend to ſubmiſſion of judgment, (which the Dr will not admit; and therefore in repeating *N.O's* words and profeſſing the like endeavour againſt Sects performed by *Proteſtants* as is by *Catholicks*, he changeth them here, and inſtead of *N.O's Submiſſion of judgment*, puts in *due ſubmiſſion*:) For, *ſome* ſubmiſſion well conſiſts with the liberty of enjoying our own opinions, and corrupting by them the Common Faith. As a ſubmiſſion to the Church's Rules and Canons in matters in their own nature *indifferent*, in matters of *Order* and *Decency*, in neceſſary *Religious Ceremonies*, and *ancient Rites* of the Chriſtian Church; a ſubmiſſion of judgment *conditional* in matters of Faith;

viz.

viz. in what the Church ſhall determine according to the Scripture; a ſubmiſſion of *Silence* or *non-publick contradicting* her Doctrines or Decrees; but this not abſolute, but only where her errours herein are not *manifeſt*, or intolerable. [For, if Proteſtants would admit an abſolute obedience of *non-contradiction*, it is granted, that this would preſerve the Church's peace and her non-diſturbance from *Hereſies*, and conſequently the *Schiſms* that ordinarily follow them. But, in conceding ſuch a ſubmiſſion, Proteſtants well ſee, there could have been no juſtifiable *Reformation* in *Luther's* time, nor can be hereafter in any other, againſt ſuch erroneous doctrines of the former Church]. Again, *the teaching them that they ought not to become their own Guides*, what ſenſe ſoever he will put upon it, yet if not this, that they ought to ſubmit their judgments to the Doctrines of their Guides, I mean, as to the *Decrees* of their *General Councils*, and ought *to follow their faith*, a thing his *Principles* admit not, it muſt fall ſhort of ſuppreſſing Hereſies or Sects, whilſt every one retains his own opinion ſtill, notwithſtanding the contrary doctrine of his Guides.

For what he adds; *That his Church exacts of none a blind obedience*: if it be not meant *a blind*, i.e. an obedience which there is no *Reaſon* for (which obedience it is granted, may never be exacted or exhibited), but ſignifies, the Church not to require of her ſubjects an *abſolute aſſent* (where all either *do*, or *ought* to, know they owe it, though they perhaps do not yet ſee the *Reaſon* or grounds of thoſe *Truths*, wherein they give it) ſo, any leſs obedience than this exacted can never cruſh Hereſies and Sects. We ſee, the Church of *England* made her *Articles for eſtabliſhing conſent in judgment and for avoiding diverſity of opinions*; Yet theſe Articles are not proved by her to their *Reaſons*, there where they are delivered. And S. *Auſtin* writ a book *De Utilitate Credendi*, i.e. of believing the Church upon ſome other grounds, before men ſaw the *Reaſons* of thoſe things that were propoſed by her to be believed: and relates a Story of thoſe, who firſt doing *this*, yielding their *obedience* to her *propoſals*, ſaid a *Gratias Deo* afterward for their underſtanding the *other*, *viz.* a good *reaſon* of the things ſhe *propoſed*;—*Gratias Deo, Qui expertos docuit, quàm vana & inania de Eccleſiâ mendax fama jactaverit*; *S.* Auguſtin, *Epiſt.* 48. and, when we ſee *no* Reaſon of the thing to be believed being not yet cleared to us, we may ſee *much*, to believe and rely on the judgment of the Church propoſing it to be believed, rather than our own. §. 95.

These

§. 96. These things our *Author* here hath returned in his own defence. In which methinks Mr *Chillingworth* hath dealt ſomewhat more *plainly* and *openly*; Who, ſeeing that a *diverſity* of *Opinions*, according to ſuch *Proteſtant Principles*, muſt be allowed; and that all *Judge*, to decide and end them, or declare amongſt theſe opinions what is *Hereſy*, muſt be taken away, beſides only the *Scriptures*; the clearneſs alſo of which Scriptures for one ſide can haraly be maintained as to ſuch places thereof, (though touching matters of great moment,) where *whole Nations* do underſtand them in a contrary ſenſe one to another; thought of another way of preſerving perpetually the *peace* of the *Church*; in ordering rather, that *diverſity of opinions* might be no hindrance to *unity of Communion*; i.e. that men of *all* opinions ſhould peaceably live together in *one* external communion. His words to this purpoſe are

‖ *ch.* 4. §. 39, 40. ‖ —*This is moſt certain, that to reduce Chriſtians to unity of Communion there are but two wayes that may be conceived probable: the one, by taking away diverſity of opinions touching matters of Religion: the other, by ſhewing that the diverſity of opinions, which is among the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtians, ought to be no hinderance to their Unity of Communion. Now the former of theſe is not to be hoped for without a miracle,—that is, unleſs it could be made evident to all men that God hath appointed ſome viſible Judge of Controverſies, to whoſe judgment all men are to ſubmit themſelves.* [What can be made more evident, than, beſides the Scriptures, the Laws, and Practice of the Church in her General Councils have made this? He goes on.]. *What then remains, but that the other way muſt be taken; and Chriſtians muſt be taught to ſet a higher value upon theſe high points of faith and obedience wherein they agree, than upon thoſe matters of leſs moment, wherein they differ; and underſtand, that agreement in thoſe ought to be more effectual to join them in one Communion, than their difference in other things of leſs moment to divide them?* But here I pray, why muſt the matters wherein they differ be of *leſs moment*, than ſome of thoſe wherein they agree? Or, are there not ſome points wherein thoſe that are involved within the General Name of Chriſtians do differ of the higheſt conſequence and concernment; or of much greater than ſome others are, wherein they accord? Since then this is a law, that ought, if in *any*, to be obſerved in *all*, times, men may conſider here of what great conſequence ſome of the ancient *Hereſies* and *differences* were: And, in ſome of thoſe points of greater moment wherein men agree now, may not they differ hereafter?

§. 97. Suppoſe then, among theſe diverſities of opinions, there happen

happen to be alſo ſome errour in ſome *Fundamental or Eſſential* (as they uſe to ſtile it,) to the *conſtitution* or *being* of a *Church*, which is *Hereſy* in their notion, ſurely ſuch Errours ought not to be tolerated among the reſt; (for example, *Socinianiſme*); but *ſuppreſſed*; and, if to be ſuppreſſed, how may it be diſcerned; or by what Judge is it to be declared ſuch? for, *knowing* it muſt precede *ſuppreſſing* it.

Is it to be known by *clear Scripture*? becauſe in all ſuch points Scripture is affirmed clear on their ſide. So Mr. *Chillingworth* ſaith, being asked this Queſtion by his Adverſary ||. For——*If Scripture* (ſaith he) *be ſufficient to inform us what is the faith, it muſt of neceſſity be alſo ſufficient to teach us what is Hereſy: ſeeing Hereſy is nothing but a manifeſt deviation from, and an oppoſition to, the faith. That which is ſtraight will plainly teach us what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifeſt the other.* Thus he. Now, this is very well; If all men, that read the Scriptures, were all agreed in the ſame Opinion. But, in our endeavouring to diſcover, what, or on which ſide is *Hereſy*, the Senſe of Scripture is the very Ball of the contention; and the Heretick, ſuppoſe a *Socinian*, will ſay for himſelf as readily as the Catholick, that the Scripture, *the ſtraight Rule* for what he holds, plainly ſhews him the tenent *crooked*, which he oppoſeth. This, I ſay, were a good Anſwer, if Mr. *Chillingworth* will maintain (as I think he doth,) and can juſtify it, that no points are *neceſſary* or *eſſential* in the Chriſtian Religion, but what all Chriſtians (or all, except a very few) in their reading the Scriptures are *agreed* in To which purpoſe || in requiring *the uſing mens beſt endeavour to believe the Scripture in the true ſenſe*, he ſaith alſo, that —— *He hopes many on all ſides* [I underſtand him in all Sects of Chriſtians and Diviſions of Opinion] *do perform this truly and ſincerely*; which they doing, he ſaith——*It is impoſſible but that they ſhould believe aright in all things neceſſary to ſalvation*: Seeming thus to make Neceſſaries thoſe points only, wherein all ſides, or the many on all ſides, are agreed. But then there can be no *Hereſies*; i.e, contradictions of any Chriſtian Societies or Parties in points *neceſſary*; if all ſides be thus *agreed* in them: Or, at leaſt, all thoſe differences we have hitherto ſeen will be no *Hereſies*, if hitherto in *neceſſaries* hath been no difference. And ſo, if any *neceſſary* point, now generally agreed on by Chriſtians, ſhall happen, hereafter, by any conſiderable party to be conteſted, it muſt be thenceforth caſhiered as a *non-neceſſary*.

|| ch. 2. §. 127

|| *Anſw. to Pref.* §. 26.

The ſame Mr. *Chillingworth* elſewhere || anſwers a like Queſtion methinks with as litle ſatisfaction: the Queſtion,——*How*

§. 98.

|| ch. 6. §. 48.

a Protestant, without any Guide save Scripture, may know he holds no fundamental errour against Scripture? To which he answers—*That we believing all the Bible, are certain enough, that we believe all that is fundamental; and so may be certain also that we hold no Heresy.* But, so, all *Heretick*, too will be no Hereticks (I suppose a *Socinian*); for, they believe the *Bible* to be *Gods Word*, as well as others. But, if he means by the Protestants believing all the *Bible* his believing the true sense of it all; what he saith is very true that such may be certain, he holds no Heresy. But, Is the Protestant then *certain* of this his believing the true sense of it all? Or, if not; but only he *believes* he doth so, at least in all necessaries; so may the Heretick too and still remain an Heretick. Since, then, Hereticks also do both urge and on their side pretend the *Scripture* clear, here the Question returns, who there is to decide on which part it is clear?

Is this then to be decided by the *Common* Sense, or *Reason*, of *Christians*? For, I know not what else can be said; our Lord's *Dic Ecclesiæ* being declined: and this *Common Reason* the Dr often appeals to. But this also is common to, and pretended by, Catholick and Heretick. Shall it be then the *Common Reason* of the much major part, or the more learned part of the Christian World? But now we are fallen upon a Judge beside the *Scripture* to decide what is *Heresy* in points necessary; and, it seems, there is need of such a one. But then, if such *Common Reason* may decide Controversies for suppressing Heresy, these are so decided already against the Protestants, as to many points, wherein the major part of the world doth declare the Scriptures to be against them. For which the inquisitive may see 3d. *Discourse Concerning the Guide in Controversy* chap. 8. formerly referred to. But, suppose here it be said, No: But the *Common Reason* of *Antiquity* shall decide this matter; Yet, since both sides pretend also this Antiquity, (as Roman-Catholicks and Protestants do in their Controversies), will not this again return us to the Common Reason of the major part of the *present* Christianity (suppose against a *Socinian*) to judge; what is the sentiment of Antiquity in such matter?

§. 99. But, besides these difficulties, this Device of Mr. *Chillingworth* and his Disciples seems much to faile in one thing more, *viz.* that *diversities* of *Opinion* will cross one another in the very *Service* and *Form* of that External Communion wherein he would have them all to be joined, so that in this Publick Service, what pleaseth one will dislike another (for which reason he saith often elsewhere, that, though Protestants have no cause to depart from the Roman Communion because of her other *Corruptions*, yet

have

have they for thoſe in her *Communion*, a concurrence wherein is exacted of them). Here therefore at laſt muſt not the *Communion* be brought to this, that all Chriſtians keeping, as they think fit, ſeveral *external* communions, yet ſhould preſerve amongſt themſelves one *Internal*? But then, as for remedying ſuch quarrels alſo about the *Form*, he ſeems to propoſe, that in ſuch external communion no manner of Service or Worſhip of God ſhould be uſed, but what *all* Chriſtians *approved*: for, ſo he requires in the following words——*That it ſhould be a joint Worſhip of God after ſuch a way, as all eſteem lawful.* But, beſides that thus ſcarce any *part* of the Church's former Publick Service would remain; and the *Church of England's Liturgy* would no more ſtand, than the *Roman*: thus the Publick Service muſt continually vary hereafter as any Chriſtians ſhall diſlike ſomthing in it; and then, what all *agree* in to day, they will not to morrow, for——*Nunquam futurum eſt, ut idem omnibus placeat* [I add, eſpecially where a thing is eſtabliſhed, *modò placeat omnibus*] *ſi res velut in medio poſita, ſingulorum arbitrio relicta fuerint*, as *Calvin* ||. The ſame propoſal or deſign as Mr *Chillingworth*, for conſerving the *Church's Peace*, in the declining of an *Eccleſiaſtical Judge*, had alſo Mr *Hales* of *Eaton* in his Tract of *Schiſme*. There p. 10. his words are theſe——*Were Liturgies and publick forms of Service ſo framed, as that they admitted not of particular and private fancies, but contained only ſuch things, as in which all Chriſtians do agree, Schiſmes on* [the variety of] *opinion were utterly vaniſhed: for, conſider of all the Liturgies that are and ever have been, and remove from them whatſoever is ſcandalous to any party, and leave nothing but what all agree on, and the evil ſhall be, that the publick Service and Honour of God ſhall no ways ſuffer. Whereas to load our publick forms with the private fancies upon which we differ, is the moſt ſoveraign way to perpetuate Schiſme unto the worlds end.* And a little before,——*I do not ſee that*, opinionum varietas *and* opinantium unitas *are* ἀσύστατα; *or that men of different opinions in Chriſtian Religion may not hold communion* in Sacris, *and both go to one Church.* And, that you may know what manner of opinions he includes here, he proceeds——*Why may not I go, if occaſion require, to an* Arian *Church, ſo there be no Arianiſme expreſſed in their Liturgy.* We ſee what a different complexion this man is of from the Ancient Church and its Governours: from our Lord's *ſi non audierit Eccleſiam, ſit tibi ſicut Ethnicus*: and S. *Paul's*——*Hæreticum hominem devita*: againſt whom may be repeated the ſame as hath been againſt Mr. *Chillingworth.*

|| *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 10. §. 31.*

Not well ſatisfied with ſuch anſwers allowing, as ſeemed §. 100.

ed to me, no means effectual for cruſhing Hereſies, or diminiſhing Sects, but rather countenancing and increaſing them, if the toleration of diverſity of opinions may be thought to do ſo, I reviewed what the Dr had ſaid in ſome pages before || concerning the *Authority* that is ſtill left in the Governours of the Church, though *Infallibility* be taken away; to ſee if this *Church-authority* might be there, as to this preſent matter, any further enforced. There I find p. 267. mentioned——*An authority of inflicting cenſures upon offenders, or of receiving into and excluding out of the Communion of the Church.* And——*That a Chriſtian Society cannot be preſerved in its purity and peace without it.* But looking further, whether this Authority was extended to excluding from her Communion perſons *diſſenting* in their opinions from the received doctrines of ſuch Church in matters of Faith; which only ſerves the turn for curing *Hereſies* and *Sects*, of this I find nothing, but only this *Power* couched in theſe general terms——*To receive into and exclude out of the Church ſuch perſons, which, according to the Law of a Chriſtian Society, are fit to be taken in or ſhut out.*

|| p. 267.

§. 101. I find him, 2ly, p. 268, allowing an Authority in the Church——*Of making Rules and Canons about matters of order and decency in the Church: Not meerly in the neceſſary circumſtances of time and place, and ſuch things, the contrary to which inply a natural indecency; but in continuing & eſtabliſhing thoſe ancient Rites of the Chriſtian Church, which were practiſed in the early times of Chriſtianity, and are in themſelves of an indifferent nature.* But, when theſe Sects deny thoſe things to be of an *indifferent nature* which this Church declares ſuch, as he knows the Sects in *England* ordinarily do, may the *Church* here lawfully require their aſſent & acknowledgment that they are of an indifferent nature, and ſo their practice of them, upon penalty, if non-conforming, of *ejecting* them out of her *Communion*? Nothing leſs than which can purge her communion of ſuch Sects, and preſerve her in *purity*, *Uniformity*, and *peace*? I do not find him adventuring thus far, as to tell us, whether the Church may require aſſent or ſubmiſſion of judgment (which muſt neceſſarily precede that of practice) from thoſe perſwaded that the matter, by the Church declared *indifferent*, is not ſo; and may upon the diſobedient inflict her cenſures; when perhaps ſhe, (as *fallible*) not they, is miſtaken in it: and, it ſeems contrary to his *Principles*. But here he ſeems to tread *ſuſpenſo pede*, and manage the Church's Authority ſomwhat timorouſly; as we may ſee by thoſe words of his that follow——*that in ſuch matters required by a lawful authority there is an advantage on the ſide of authority* [I underſtand him, that authority hath the advantage

vantage for challenging obedience] *againſt a conſcience ſcrupulous* [or doubting ; but what for a conſcience not doubting but fully perſwaded otherwiſe ? As men may be free from *doubting* in a thing, whereof they are not *certain*] *which* [authority] *ought to overrule the practice of ſuch who are the members of that Church, over-rules his Practice* ; but what ſaith he of ſuch Authority its overruling the *Judgment* ? Which ſtanding contrary, it is certain none may practiſe, though that which is right, againſt their judgment. This wary Concluſion in the 2d *Propoſition* concerning Church Authority is ſomwhat like to thoſe *general* words in the firſt—— *A power of excluding out of the Church ſuch perſons, as are fit to be ſhut out according to the laws of a Chriſtian Society.* [I ſuppoſe he means ſuch laws as are, or elſe ought to be, in a Chriſtian Society. Of which *ought to be* who muſt judge ?]

Again, he affirms (p. 261.) an Authority in the Church §. 102.
of propoſing matters of faith, and directing men in Religion : directing *ſeveral ways* ; *by particular inſtruction of doubtful perſons to whom the help of their Guides*, he ſaith, *is the moſt ready and uſeful* : *by a publick way of inſtructing* [viz. in Sermons] : *by the repreſentative Clergy* meeting together to *reform* any *abuſes in practice*, or *errours in doctrine* ; *and, when a more General conſent cannot be obtained, to publiſh and declare what thoſe errours are* ; *and to do as much as in them lies to reform them*, viz. *by requiring a conſent to ſuch propoſitions as are agreed upon for that end, of thoſe who are to enjoy the publick offices of teaching and inſtructing others. Not to the end that all theſe propoſitions ſhould be believed as Articles of Faith* ; *but becauſe no Reformation can be effected, if perſons may be allowed to preach and officiate in the Church in a way contrary to the deſigne of ſuch a Reformation.* Here then we have an Authority allowed *to propoſe matters of faith* [which *propoſal* any Hereſy or Sect can well comply with] : *to inſtruct doubtful perſons* [but in points neceſſary, wherein Scriptures are clear according to him, no ſuch *doubt* needs to be] : in which doubting the *help* of their *Guides* is ſaid to be the *moſt ready and uſeful* [but, for ſome reaſon or other, this Author declines to ſay, *Neceſſary*] : an Authority of Synods to declare what *errours* there are *in doctrine*, or *abuſes in practice*, *and* [in general he ſaith] *to do as much, as in them lies, to reform them by requiring a conſent of its Clergy to ſuch propoſitions as the Synod agrees upon.*

But, meanwhile, here occurrs nothing, that ſuch as ſtill §. 103.
hold the *errours in doctrine*, againſt which this Church declareth, may not yet peaceably enjoy her Communion. He ſaith, theſe Synods *as much as in them lies* may reform ſuch errours, but he ſaith not

this

this lies in their power to require any one to *aſſent* to the contrary truths upon penalty of being expelled from this Church's communion: By which means only this Church can be purged and cured of the mixture of Sects and Hereſies, and be preſerved in its purity and peace and conſent of judgment in matters of Religion: which the *Title* prefixed (faith is the deſign of the *Church of England's* 39. *Articles*. I ſay, Whereas the Church hath no way for her preſervation in unity of faith and worſhip, but that of our Lord's, and his Apoſtle's, *poſt unam aut alteram correptionem* to ſhut ſuch out of her Communion, the Reader may obſerve, here is no word of this: I do not ſay of ſhutting *any* or *all* out of the Church's Communion (this he allows in his firſt Propoſition); but not ſhutting any out on this account, *viz.* their *diſſent* and *non-conformity* to the Church's Articles of Faith and Religion.

§. 104. For, *as for conſent* ſaid to be required from the *Clergy* to ſuch propoſitions as ſuch Synods ſhall agree upon, ſuppoſing here be meant by this Conſent, a profeſſion of the *belief* of the truth of them, 1. This conſent is required of the Clergy only hypothetically, if they deſire to officiate in the *Miniſtry*; not abſolutely, that they may enjoy her *Communion*: Nor will this remedy any Sect or Hereſy as to ſuch, who for this cauſe decline the Miniſtry. 2ly. By the Church's *requiring their conſent* he ſeems not to mean an aſſent to the truth of ſuch Articles, but either with Mr ‖ *Pref.* §, 39. *Chillingworth* ‖ a conſent to them or to the doctrine of this Church *that who believes and lives according to them undoubtedly ſhall be ſaved*, and—*that there is no error in them which may neceſſitate or warrant any man to diſturb the peace or renounce the communion of this Church*; both which fall ſhort of requiring an aſſent to the truth of theſe Articles, or of this doctrine: Or, with Biſhop *Bramhal*, and himſelf *Ration. Account* p. 55. a Conſent for peace ſake not to *oppoſe* them; for ſo Dr *Stillingfleet* quotes the Biſhop there ſaying ‖ ——*We do not oblige any man to believe, but only not to contradict them.* And ſo the Qualification the Dr adds in the words following here ſeems to explain this Clergy-Conſent: —— *Not*, ſaith he, *to the end that all thoſe propoſitions ſhould be believed as Articles of Faith; but that none might preach or officiate in a way contrary to the deſigne of the Reformation*, [i.e. as I underſtand him, preach againſt any of the reformed doctrines]. *Not that all thoſe propoſitions* (ſaith he) *ſhould be believed as Articles of Faith.* Very perplex'd this. For I aſk, Are not *ſome* of theſe *Articles* at leaſt then required by the Church of *England* to be believed as *Articles of Faith*? Otherwiſe the Engliſh Clergy, as to the whole Body of Chriſtian Faith, is left to their liberty to *diſbelieve* any

‖ *Reply to Chalcedon* p. 264.

part

part thereof. And, if ſome be required to be ſo believed; yet, ſo long as no diſtinction at all is made, any of the Clergy may leave out of his Faith *which* Articles he pleaſeth. For example: one inclined to *Socinianiſme*, leave out that of God the *Son's Conſubſtantiality* with God the *Father*. But, next, ſuppoſing the belief of ſome Articles expreſly and diſtinctly required of this Clergy; yet then, what if this Church, as being fallible, ſhould be *miſtaken* in ſome of them? But now, conſidering the Clergy's conſent not required for *belief*, but on the latter account; *viz.* that none of them ſhould teach the people contrary to the *Church's Reformation*; Yet here again, ſince this Church may poſſibly be faulty in ſomething it reforms, is this juſt to ſtop the mouths of all Gods *Miniſtry* in this Church, that none of them may ſpeak againſt it? If it be, why is not the ſame thing as lawful to the Church of *Rome*, as that of *England*? And then, if her Clergy alſo had been obliged to obſerve this, *Luther* and other *Reformers* being part of this Clergy, how could there lawfully have been a Reformation?; and why is the modern practice of the *Roman* Church in this matter declaimed-againſt by *Proteſtants*, as the higheſt *Tyranny*? as alſo that of the Church of *England* is by the *Presbyterians*. Theſe perplexities ſeem to attend the Dr's qualification: But, as hath been ſaid before, whatever conſent may be exacted of the Clergy, there is ſtill left to Hereſies and Sects the liberty of this Church's *Communion* though out of its *Miniſtery*, for any Barr that the Dr hath put in here to hinder it. And ſo I leave theſe things here, briefly repreſented, to the further Conſideration of the Dr, and his Proteſtant Reader.

THE

THE SECOND PART.

Annotations on Dr *Stillingfleet's* Anſwer to *N.O's Conſiderations* of his *Principles.*

HAving in the former *Diſcourſe reviewed the* Conſiderations, and made ſome *Neceſſary* Reflections *on the Drs to me ſeeming-unſatisfactory Anſwers, as to ſeveral principal matters urged therein againſt his* Principles, *I ſee not why I might not take the ſame liberty, as himſelf hath uſed toward* N.O, *to let paſs the reſt of his Diſcourſe* unreplied-to; *eſpecially where it digreſſeth to many other by-matters, and neither vindicates his* Principles, *nor refutes the* Conſiderations. *But, leſt that in his Book, which is litle pertinent to the anſwering of* N.O's Diſcourſe, *yet be ſaid to be much to the defence of the* Proteſtant *Cauſe; and ſuch things in it to have moſt weight, whatever I ſhall have omitted, I have drawn up ſome* Annotations *upon his whole Book; following him, whither his matter leads me: Though theſe* Animadverſions *many times be very compendious, as ſuppoſing an* intelligent *Reader, and endeavouring to avoid tedioufneſs in* Recapitulations, ſelf-juſtifications, complaints *on the* Adverſary, *and the like; with which, in multiplied* Replies *after a Controverſy formerly agitated to and fro, the Reader (as one much more unconcerned in the* Writer's *reputation, than themſelves are) uſeth to be much afflicted, confounded, and tired out; for which cauſe* Writings *of this nature are ſoon laid aſide; and therefore I may be excuſed if I beſtow the leſs pains, where I ſee it likely to be caſt away.*

For the matters in him which I think fit to ſpeak to; in Epitomizing *or ſummoning up in brief what he ſaith, the Reader, or perhaps himſelf, would complain I wronged his ſenſe; to* tranſcribe *every thing at* length *I have not the leiſure; nor (had I this) a purſe well to beat the charge of the Impreſſion. So, mentioning ſome words only, and noting the page, I leave the Reader rather to peruſe it in his own* Diſcourſe *uncontracted and undivided from the reſt; and with all the vigour that the* Context *and other* circumſtantials *may afford it; well*

knowing, that who desires rightly to understand a Controversy must inform himself what the Disputants say, not in one another's, but their own, writings: and also chiefly intending these Remarks for such, who have, and value, his Book: and, where I speak to any passage that which may seem satisfactory, I desire the judicious Reader to apply it himself to the consequents, or to the like matter recurring in other places, without my further trouble herein. Meanwhile I offer my Prayers for him to our Good Lord, that he would illuminate and direct him, through the many great Controversies which are now agitated in Christendome concerning the sense of the Holy Scriptures, in the safest way to his salvation: whether this be, from the Church's Fallibility in Necessaries, every Christian's liberty to judge and discern Truth for himself; or, from the Church's Infallibility in Necessaries, every Christian's duty to obey and learn the Truth, where disputed, from Her: the main Contest between us. I likewise humbly beseech his Heavenly Majesty to protect his Truth, & the maintainers of it, whoever they be: and, if in any thing here I have offended (though unwillingly) against it, to discover at least to the pious Reader my errours; that, wherein deceived my self, I may not also deceive others.

The Figure enclosed in the following Discourse between Parentheses thus ( ) is to be numbred from the bottom of the page.

Annota-

Annotations on Dr *Stillingfleets* firſt Section.

Dr *St's Anſw. to Conſid.* p. 75. l. 13. *I paſs by therefore all thoſe unhandſome Reflections*, &c.

THe *unhandſome reflections*, if any ſuch there be in *N. O's Preface*, it is a commendable charity in the Dr to *paſs by*, and not exaggerate: But, *two* things in the ſame *Preface*, that ſeem very conſiderable, I wonder he *paſſeth by* alſo & ſpeaks not to. The one contained in theſe words, p. 1. *That he accuſeth the* whole Catholick Church *of God both Weſtern and Eaſtern (for, the ſame practices, as to ſeveral of his Idolatries, are in both) for ſo many ages before* Luthers *time, of Idolatry; and this Idolatry as groſs as that of the Heathens.* || *Which accuſation, ſurely, muſt unchurch this great Body, and quite divorce this Adultereſs from Chriſt. For we cannot think but the Dr will maintain the teaching ſo manifold an Idolatry in this Church* [viz. Teaching the lawfulneſs of adoring the Hoaſt, of Invocating Saints, of Worſhiping Images] *to be a Fundamental Errour.* Thus *N. O* there. Now, of this Church Catholick in every age we ſay in our Creed---*Credo Unam Sanctam Catholicam & Apoſtolicam Eccleſiam.* But, how is it *Sancta* (as Arch-biſhop *Laud* ſaid concerning *Hereſy* †) if it may fall into, and alſo teach, ſo groſs and ſo manifold an *Idolatry*? as groſs (ſaith this Author) as the Idolatry taught and practiſed by the *Heathen*: which Idolatry, charged by him on the Church of *Rome*, muſt needs be a mortal ſin, and ſo, unacknowledged, or unrepented of, not only hazard, but deſtroy, ſalvation: and therefore muſt the *teaching* alſo of the lawfulneſs of ſuch a practice by any *Church*, ſo expreſly contrary to the Divine Command, be a *fundamental errour*; if an errour that excludes from ſalvation may be called ſo. *Numb.* 1. || *See Rom. Idol. p.* 69. 134. *&c.* 142, 159, 861. † §. 21. *n.* 5.

I find indeed elſewhere our Author in his Anſwer to Mr *I.W.* || denying, that the teaching of the Lawfulneſs, (or alſo the Duty), of ſuch an *Idolatry* as is practiſed in the *Roman Church* is a *Fundamental* Errour, or ſuch as, held and practiſed without any retractation, abſolutely excludes from ſalvation. So he ſaith there p. 20.—*That ſome kind of Idolatry is conſiſtent with the being* *N.* 2. || *Dr Stilling againſt Dr Stil.*

ing of a Church. And——*That kind only, which implies more Gods than one, doth unchurch a people.* And ſo p. 22.——*That all ſorts of Idolatry do not neceſſarily deſtroy the eſſentials of a Church*; ——*Although* (ſaith he p. 21.) *That of the Roman Church makes the ſalvation of perſons in her Communion extremely hazardous.* Thus he. Now, by any Society that profeſſeth Chriſtianity its being unchurched, or wanting the being or *eſſentials* of a Church, I ſuppoſe, he means its ceaſing to be any longer a true member of the *Catholick Church* which is mentioned in our Creed.

N. 3. Now then, the better to diſcern how con-or incon-ſiſtent it may be with *ſalvation* and the *Being* of a *Church*, let us firſt ſee, how he repreſents this *inferiour ſort* of *Idolatry*, as he calls it here, ‖ (oppoſed to a groſſer, which doth unchurch men), which is taught and practiſed in the *Church* of *Rome*, and which his charity thinks hinders it not from having ſtill all the *eſſentials* of a true Church. In his *Roman Idol.* p. 69. ſpeaking there of the Roman Idolatry in *Image-worſhip* he ſaith——*It ſeems much more reaſonable for me to worſhip God by proſtrating my ſelf to the Sun or any of the Heavenly bodies, nay to an Ant or a Fly, than to a picture or an Image: For in them I ſee great evidences of the power and wiſdom & goodneſs of God, which may ſuggeſt venerable apprehenſions of God to my minde; whereas theſe can have nothing worthy admiration, unleſs it be the skill of the painter or Artificer. And I cannot for my heart underſtand, why I may not as well, nay better burn Incenſe, and ſay my prayers to the Sun, having an intention only to honour the true* ‖ p. 70. *God by it, as to do both theſe to an Image.* And afterward ‖ ——*I ſhould have been tempted to have laughed at their folly and deſpiſed their weakneſs, who ſhould plead for the worſhip of God in or by a dull and rude Image, and condemn me for honouring God in the moſt noble parts of the Creation.* Where, doth not he make the *Heathens* Idolatry, in their proſtrating themſelves, ſaying their prayers, and burning incenſe to the *Sun* (which ſurely is a *mortal ſin* in them, though meanwhile they held this *fundamental* truth *that the honour which is due only to God is not to be given to a meer Creature*) more *rational* and more excuſable than the *Roman*'s committing the ſame Idolatry to an *Image*?

N. 4. Again, concerning the *Roman* Idolatry in their *Adoration* of the *Hoaſt* Ibid. p. 134. he compares it with the *Manichees* adoration of the *Sun*, and makes this the worſe of the two——*If* (ſaith he) *a miſtake in this caſe will excuſe them, it would excuſe the groſſeſt Idolatry in the world.*——*Let us conſider two perſons equally perſwaded* [one] *that the Sun is now the tabernacle of Chriſt, and that he is really preſent there*——*he being ſo often in Scripture called*

the

the true light, Jo. 1.8.9. *and another, that he is really present by Transubstantiation in the Sacrament; I would fain understand why the one should not be as free from Idolatry, as the other.* Saith he not here again, That, if their mistake [i.e. of Christ's *Corporal Presence* in the *Eucharist*] will excuse the Idolatry of the *Roman* Church, it will as much excuse the *grossest* Idolatry in the world? and, that therefore this *Roman Idolatry* is without all excuse? And p. 136. he makes——*the worshiping* false *Gods, supposing them to be* true, *as venial a fault, as worshiping that for the true God which is not so* [supposed by him the *Roman* case in *Adoration* of the *Hoast*]. Now here, in his Answer to Mr. *I.W.* p. 24. he saith——*When many false Gods are joined with the true in the same worship, the true God is rejected*: and that this cannot consist with the essentials of a true Church. I subsume, then, neither can the crime of the *Roman Church* equalling it.

Again, concerning the *Roman* Idolatry in the *Worship* and *Invocation* of *Saints*, thus he in *Rom. Idol.* p. 159.——*Upon the same account that the Heathen did give divine honour to their inferiour Deities, those in the Roman Church do so to Angels and Saints. For the Heathens made a difference in their sacrifices to the supreme God; and their inferiour Deities and their Heroes: so that if the putting any difference in the way of Religious Worship doth excuse the one, it must do the other also. Did the Heathen use solemn Ceremonies of making any capable of Divine Worship? So does the Roman Church. Did they set up their Images in publick places of Worship and there kneel before them, and invocate those represented by them? so does the Roman Church. Did they consecrate Temples and erect Altars to them, and keep Festivals and burn incense before them? so does the Roman Church. Lastly did they offer up sacrifices in those temples to the honour of their lesser Deities and Heroes? So does the Roman Church.* And p. 161. he saith—— *It is evident that the Roman Church hath reserved no part of Divine worship peculiar to God himself any more than the Heathen did.* And——*That there can be no material difference, that the Heathen called those they worshiped Gods, but they do not so in the Roman Church.* I say then: Are not all the complaints and aggravations, made in Scripture of the *Heathens* Idolatry, as applicable to the *Roman*: and they both, as to this *Crime*, at the same distance from Salvation or the Divine Mercy: Unless the *Roman* be at a greater, from having so much more *light*? Thus then is the *Roman* Idolatry, in that *Discourse*, frequently represented by Him. *N.* 5.

Now, after all this, would not one wonder at the greatness of this man's *Charity*, in maintaining in his Answer to Mr. *N.* 6.

I.W.

T.W. ſuch a Church, as in all theſe Idolatries *equals* the *heathens*, yet to retain ſtill all the *eſſentials* of a true *Church*; and ſuch Opinions and Practices, without any retractation of their errour, or reforming their fault, to hazard only, and not deſtroy, men's Salvation? And muſt not this his *Charity* be enlarged further, to *the Heathens* alſo; that they in worſhiping and ſacrificing to their *falſe Gods* and *Heroes*, and the *Manicheans* in worſhiping the *Sun*, offended nothing in this matter againſt any *eſſential* of Gods true Religion; nor by ſuch a worſhip forfeited their *ſalvation?* Whilſt they alſo, as well as the Church of *Rome*, in general make profeſſion of this *fundamental* point in *Religion*; viz. *that the Honour, which is due only to God is not to be given to a meer Creature*; and, *that, if given to any Creature, it is Idolatry.*

N.O. 7. But now, to examine theſe things a little more cloſely, 1. Firſt, Whereas he ſaith p. 22.—*If thoſe of the Roman Church can prove that all ſorts of Idolatry do neceſſarily deſtroy the eſſentials of a Church, the conſequence is, we muſt have leſs charity for them than we had before; and ſuch a conceſſion from us* [that they do not] *doth not ſhew their guilt to be leſs, but only our charity to be greater*; It may be obſerved, that *N.O.* here charged him not of making the *Church* of *Rome* only but the whole *Catholick* Church, & both the *Weſtern* and *Eaſtern*, as is ſhewed in the 3d *Diſcourſe* touching the *Guide in Controverſy ch.* 8. guilty of ſuch an *Idolatry*: which if ſo, and this Idolatry he imputes ſhould be affirmed by him a *fundamental errour* or *miſs-practice*, then he muſt, by his rendring the Church Catholick guilty thereof, unchurch It alſo for many ages; and ſo deny an *Article* of our *Creed*. From whence it appears, that he, how farr ſoever inclined by *charity*, yet is alſo upon neceſſity forced, in his faſtening ſuch an *Idolatry* on the *Roman* Church, as extends alſo to the *Catholick*: forced, I ſay, (in defence of his *Creed*) to maintain ſuch *ſpecies* of Idolatry not to *unchurch* a Body, or diminiſh any of the Eſſentials of a Church; nor to *deſtroy*, but only to hazard, *ſalvation*; leſt he ſhould deſtroy ſalvation in the Catholick Church, and alſo unchurch It for ſeveral *Ages*. Now (as the Archbiſhop p. 141.)—*All Divines Ancient and Modern, Romaniſts and Reformers, agree in this, that the whole Militant Church of Chriſt* [i.e. in any age; and that as to the Religion profeſſed in it] *cannot fall away into a General Apoſtaſy*. And ſo this, if proved againſt him by Catholicks, that ſuch *Idolatry* doth *unchurch* any Society that teaches and practiſes it, muſt conſtrain him to free the *Roman* Church of ſuch a charge, and ſo to confeſs his own arguments whatever brought to ſuch a purpoſe to be *faulty* and unconcluſive. And, indeed, the favour here the *Church* of *Rome*,

Rome, notwithſtanding ſuch heavy charges as theſe upon her, receives from *Proteſtants*, of being affirmed ſtill a *true Church*, ſeems to be on this account, becauſe elſe they ſhould miſs *a Catholick Church* for divers ages before *Luther*, and derive the ſucceſſion of their *Clergy* from a Body already *unchurched*. Thus, we ſee what obligation the Church of *Rome* hath to his *Charity*, in maintaining *ſome ſorts* of Idolatry to conſiſt with a true Church: Where indeed, it appears both the *Catholick's* intereſt to prove the Idolatry imputed to it not conſiſtent with the being of a *true* Church; whereby they free the *Roman* Church from any ſuch Idolatry; and the *Dr's* intereſt, to ſhew ſuch Idolatry no *fundamental* errour or miſcarriage, ſo to retain ſtill the *Roman* Church a true Church, *viz.* That ſo alſo the *Catholick* of ſome ages, and the *preſent* alſo, that is beſide the Proteſtant Churches, may be *ſo*.

2. Next, to examine the *Reaſons* he brings for juſtifying ſuch his Aſſertion. In that Anſwer to *J.W.* p. 30. he ſaith——*That the very being of a Church doth ſuppoſe the neceſſity of what is required to be believed in order to ſalvation:* [i.e. that all things neceſſary to ſalvation are believed in it; which is granted]. 2ly ſaith——*That whatever Church owns thoſe things which are antecedently neceſſary to the being of a Church cannot ſo long ceaſe to be a true Church.* Which alſo is granted: But what are theſe things that are neceſſary to the being of a Church? For explaining this p. 31. he ſaith——*That theſe Articles are ſuch as have the teſtimony of the whole Chriſtian world of all ages:* [and ſo of the *Roman* Church]. Again Ibid.——*That nothing ought to be owned as neceſſary to ſalvation by Chriſtian Societies, but ſuch things which by all thoſe Societies are acknowledged antecedently neceſſary to the being of the Catholick Church.* Where, if the belief of nothing is to be accounted *neceſſary* to *ſalvation*, or to the *being* of the Church *Catholick*, but *what hath the teſtimony and approbation of the whole Chriſtian world of all ages*; or, *what by all Chriſtian Societies is acknowledged neceſſary to ſuch a being*, it ſeems to me to follow, that all Chriſtian Societies muſt be *true* Churches or true members of the *Catholick*; and ſo * that none are or can be *Heretical*; ſince all Heretical Churches are non-Catholick: (See Archbiſhop *Laud* p. 141.): and, * that no ſuch point can be *eſſential* to ſuch Being, wherein any Chriſtian Society hath *diſſented* from the reſt; and ſo, though this diſſent be in ſome Hereſy, yet neither will this render any ſuch Church not to be *Catholick* ſtill; which it remains to be by vertue of thoſe points that have alſo its conſenting with all the reſt; (for, it ſeems, thoſe points only wherein it conſents with the reſt conſtitute the Church Catholick:) and ſo the *Arian*, *Neſtorian*, *Pelagian*, are true Churches, and *N.* 8.

and parts of the *Catholick*,

N. 9. But, this being paſſed by, the Queſtion will ſtill be, What in particular thoſe points are, that are *eſſentials* to the *being* of a true Church? and, Why the *contrary* to what the Church of *Rome teacheth* and practiſeth in the matter of Idolatry, as we ſee our Author hath deſcribed it before, is not *one* of them? To this purpoſe therefore he ſaith p. 32.——*That the ancient Creeds of the Catholick Church are the beſt meaſure of thoſe things which were believed to be neceſſary to ſalvation* [or to the being of a true Church]: and p. 28. he ſaith——*The main fundamental points of doctrine are contained in the Apoſtles Creed:* and p. 33.——*When we enquire into the eſſentials of a Church, we think it not neceſſary to go any farther than the doctrinal points of faith; the reaſon is becauſe Baptiſm admits men into the Church upon the profeſſion of the true faith in the Father Son and Holy Ghoſt: and whatever is ſufficient to make a member of the Church, that is in it ſelf ſufficient, being embraced, to make a Church.* Thus he. From whence he collects, that the *Roman* Church's teaching ſome *kind* of *Idolatry* that deſtroys no Article of the Creed profeſſed in Baptiſm, and ſo no eſſential of the true Church, cannot therefore render it no *true* Church.

N. 10. But here, 1. Firſt, may not the ſame be ſaid of teaching *any kind* of *Idolatry* whatever, that it is not againſt any *Article* of the *Creed*; which ſpeaks only of matters of *Belief*, not *Worſhip*? Yet he grants that ſome kind of Idolatry ſuch as this, teaching people to joine *falſe* Gods with the *true* in the ſame worſhip is a || p. 24. a fundamental errour, || and deſtroying the being of a true Church. Now, If he ſaith this is, by a *clear conſequence*, againſt the *Creed*; muſt he not ſay the ſame of the *Roman* Idolatry in adoring the Euchariſtical Bread? of which he affirms p. 136. in the words forecited——*That the worſhiping falſe Gods ſuppoſing them to be true is as venial a fault, as worſhiping that for the true God which is not ſo*: [as he ſaith the *Roman* Church doth]. Again; will not this alſo be an errour againſt the *Creed*, if any acknowledging one Supreme God, yet reſerve no part of Divine Worſhip as *peculiar* to him which they do not teach may be lawfully given to a *meer* † *Rom. Idol. Creature*, which thing he chargeth alſo on the *Roman* Idolatry † in p. 161. theſe words——*It is evident they* [of the Church of *Rome* in thoſe Honours which they teach may be given to Saints and Angels] *have reſerved no part of Divine Worſhip peculiar to God himſelf, any more than the Heathen did.* Here is a *true* Church then, without retaining any *peculiar* worſhip in it, that is given to the *true* God.

But

But 2ly. Supposing the Idolatry taught in the Church of *Rome* to trespass against no *Article* of the *Creed*, Can no *Doctrine* render a Society no true Church (by *no true Church* I mean, and so, I suppose, doth he, no true part or member of the Church Catholick, though it should be still a Church professing Christianity) save only *such*? The Creed speaks not of matters belonging to Gods *Worship*, nor of the *Ten Commandements*, the First and Second of which prohibite Idolatry: Yet is the *Worshiping* of *God* as essential to a true Church, as *Believing* in Him; and the observance of the *Tenn Commandements* as necessary to Salvation, as the belief of the matter contained in the *Creed*; and *Teaching* the *contrary* to them, by any Society, (as for example, to teach it lawful to commit *Murders* or *Adultery*; or *Theft*) as destructive to the essence or being of a true Church: and the Dr in his 30th *Principle* denies, *Errors in Opinion to be more dangerous to mens Souls, than a Vicious life is.* Neither are any in Baptism admitted into the Church simply upon *professing* of the *Creed*, (pressed by the Dr || as if nothing els were necessary) but also on the promise of yielding *obedience* to God's *Commandements*. No Heretical Church is any true member of the Catholick; And would not such *doctrines* teaching contrary to the 10. Commandements be great *Heresies?* as we know, Denying the lawfulness of Marriage hath been anciently condemned as such? And then, will not the *Idolatry* taught in the *Roman* Church be such an *Heresy*; which expressly opposeth (as he will have it) the Second Commandement? Of which he saith *Rom Idol.* p. 59.—*It cannot enter into my mind how, God should have forbidden the worship of Images by more express and emphatical words than he hath done in it.* Which leaves the *Roman* Church void of any excuse of involuntary ignorance, to free her herein from a *mortal* sin. The *Catholick Church*, and all the parts of it are believed in our Creed to be *Holy*, as well as *Orthodoxe*, and the one to be of its *Essence*, distinguishing it from other Christian Societies, as well as the other: To be *Holy*, at least so far, as to teach the lawfulness of no Mortal Sin, such as unrepented of destroyes Salvation. And, whether the *Roman* Idolatry, as he hath described it before, contrary to the express words and sense of the Second *Commandement*, and no more excusable by any involuntary ignorance than the *Heathens*, can be any thing less, I leave to his better consideration; And this, for his recalling his *Charge*, upon it, of so *great* a *Guilt*; since, he cannot, his *Assertion* of its being a *true Church*. Whilst I conclude with Mr. *Thorndike's* Admonition || to those Protestants, who charge the *Pope to be Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters*—*Let*

N. 11.

|| *Stillingfl. against Stillingfl. p.* 33.

|| *Justweigh. ch.* 2. *p.* 11.

not them (ſaith he) *lead the people by the noſe to believe that they can prove their ſuppoſition, when they cannot; and then expect that it be maintained by them, that owne the Church of* Rome *for a true Church; and therefore, that muſt contradict themſelves if they maintain it.* [i.e. their ſuppoſition of *Papiſts* being *Idolaters*].

*N.*12. ‖ *p.*31. & 23

As for our Author's diſtinguiſhing ‖ between the *Eſſentials* of a Church, and the *Integrity* or *ſoundneſs* of it; and ſaying —*That a man is a true man, though he have the plague upon him.* To this I anſwer: 1ſt. That, if the plague be mortal, the man muſt neceſſarily ceaſe thereby to be a man. And 2ly. That, whatever may be required to the *integrity* or ſoundneſs of a *Church*, right Doctrines in *Practicals* are as neceſſary to its eſſence, as in *Speculatives*; if *Mortal* Sin exclude from ſalvation, as well as an *erroneous* Faith. This of *N.O's* charging him in his Preface—*For accuſing the whole Catholick Church of God, both Weſtern and Eaſtern* (*for, the ſame practices, as to ſeveral of his Idolatries, are in both*) *for ſo many Ages before* Luther's *time of Idolatry, and this Idolatry as groſs as that of Heathens: and for his thus unchurching this great Body, and quite divorcing this Adultereſs from Chriſt.* From which charge that which he hath ſaid in his *Anſwer* to *I.W.* ſeems no way to free him.

*N.*13. † *p.*6. ‖ *See ch.*4. §.18.

The other Conſiderable in the ſame *Preface* † which he hath paſſed by and ſaid nothing to, is this: That Mr. *Chillingworth*, ‖ and, ſince him, ſeveral Divines of the Church of *England*, (and among theſe Dr *St.*) in their denying Superiour Councils to have the juſt Authority of obliging their Subjects to the yielding of Aſſent to their Declarations, are conſtrained alſo to diſclaim ſuch a Submiſſion of *Aſſent* to the Articles of Religion, and Book of Common-Prayer paſſed in the National Synods of the Church of *England*; Yet which Submiſſion of Aſſent this Church hath formerly challenged in her *Canons*; and ſeverely, even with Eccleſiaſtical Death, puniſhed the Refuſers untill they ſhould repent (not their external diſobedience or contradiction, but) their wicked errour: The 39. Articles being declared in the ſame 5th Canon—*To have been by this Church agreed upon for the avoiding Diverſities of Opinions, and the eſtabliſhing of Conſent touching true Religion.* To which I add; that *Conſent touching true Religion* is Conſent, ſurely, touching *matters* of *Faith*: and again; that *eſtabliſhing of Conſent* is to be underſtood, amongſt all the *Members* of the ſaid Church, (all whom it concerns to be united and eſtabliſhed in the *true Religion*), as well as amongſt the *Clergy*. Therefore the Stile of the two Canons runs generally: *Whoſo ſhall hereafter affirm the Articles &c, in any thing erroneous:* And

And the excommunicating of thoſe, who will not abjure their holding *Popery* or *Socinianiſme* (ſee *Synod* 1640. Can. 3. and 4.) is not of the *Clergy*, but *any* whatever. [Which may be confirmed alſo by the practice of the Synods of other Reformed Churches abroad proceeding to the excommunication of Diſſenters from their Doctrine. To this purpoſe in the Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline of the Reformed Churches of *France* the 31. Article of the 5th Chapter *Du Conſiſtoire* runs thus——*Si un ou pluſieurs* &c. *If any one or more of the people ſhall raiſe any debate, to the breach of the Church's Unity, concerning any point of Doctrine, the Form of the Catechiſm, Sacraments, Publick Service* &c. [if matters cannot be otherwiſe compoſed, in the laſt place] *a National Synod is to be aſſembled, which ſhall give them an hearing with all holy liberty; and in it ſhall be made a full and final Reſolution by the Word of God, to which reſolution, if they refuſe to acquieſce in every particular point, and with an expreſs diſavowing their errours recorded* [now ſurely this diſavowing their errours is aſſenting to the contrary truths] *they ſhall be cut off from the Church.* Here then is required a punctual aſſent to what the ſentence of the Synod, not the perſons convented, ſhall judge to be the ſenſe of God's Word, as it is alſo there cautioned before; *ſans que la deciſion en appartienne a autrez qu' au Synode.* And the ſame courſe is taken againſt the *Remonſtrants* by the *Synod* of *Dort.* See *Acta Synod. Dordrecht.* Seſſ. 138.——*Synodus hæc Dordrechtana, pro authoritate, quam ex Dei verbo in omnia Eccleſiarum ſuarum membra obtinet, in Chriſti nomine injungit omnibus & ſingulis in Fœderato Belgio Eccleſiarum Paſtoribus* &c. *ut hanc ſacram veritatis ſalutaris doctrinam* [viz. that delivered in the 91. Articles concerning the five points in controverſy] *ſinceram & inviolatam conſervent, illam populo & juventuti fideliter proponant, & explicent* &c. [which ſurely includes the requiring their aſſent to, and belief of, theſe Articles]; excommunicating the diſobedient ——*donec per ſeriam reſipiſcentiam, dictis, factis, ſtudiis contrariis comprobatam, Eccleſiæ ſatisfaciant, atque ad ejus communionem recipiantur.* This I have added, to ſhew the ſame proceedings of other forreign Synods of the Reformed with theſe of *England.* To which now to return] Either in the forementioned expreſſions theſe Engliſh National Synods do excommunicate all thoſe, whoever affirm, any thing in the former Common-Prayer-Book to be repugnant to the Scriptures, (as all thoſe muſt do, who affirm, the impoſing, ſomething there to be done or uſed in God's worſhip which he hath not commanded, to be a thing repugnant to the Scriptures) or who do affirm any thing in the 39 Articles to be erroneous; and then, what a number of perſons are there

at this preſent in this Kingdom of *England* that are *excommunicated* by the Church of *England*? Or, if no conſent to her Articles is required in general of all her Subjects, what an indulgence is here for variety of *Sects*, every one being left in matters touching true Religion to *Liberty* of *Opinion*? Yet, for the *avoiding* of *which*, this Church ſaith, ihe compoſed theſe *Articles*. This of the Doctors *Paſſings-by* in the Preface.

*Pag.*76. *l.*3. *The Controverſy in ſhort is this*; *Whether Proteſtants who reject the Roman Church's Authority and Infallibility, can have any ſufficient Foundation to build their faith upon*?——There is no ſuch *Queſtion* propoſed by *N.O.* And, if there had, it would have been propoſed on this manner, in order eſpecially to the Doctors 13*th* and 15*th Principle*; Whether a Proteſtant, in refuſing the ſubmiſſion of his judgment to the Authority or Infallibility of the Catholick Church in her Councils, can have, in ſeveral Articles of Neceſſary Faith, wherein the ſenſe of Scriptures is controverted, as ſure a foundation of his Faith, as he who ſubmits his judgment to the foreſaid Authority, or alſo Infallibility?

Ibid. l,11. *Thoſe of the Church of* Rome *charge us*; *That we can have no certainty of our faith as Chriſtians without their Infallibility.* The *Certainty* pretended by this Author in his *Principles*, and oppoſed by *N.O.* is ſuch a Certainty, from the Clearneſs of the Senſe of Scriptures in *all* points of neceſſary Faith to *every* perſon, as that *no perſon* whatſoever, that uſeth his beſt endeavour (I ſuppoſe he means ſuch endeavour as conſiſts with his Vocation), to underſtand them, can *miſtake* therein. And this is denied by Catholicks, and ſufficiently confuted by Experience.

Ib. l. (9.) *The occaſion was my Adverſaries calling for Grounds and Principles*, &c. This account that follows not concerning *N.O*; and, thoſe worthy Perſons, whom the Doctor oppoſeth, being much better able to return an anſwer for themſelves, if perhaps they think this worth their pains, I ſhall paſs on to *f.*79.

Annotations on §. 2. Of the Notion of Infallibility.

PAge 79. *l. ult. Sometimes they apply Infallibility to the Object that is believed.* And hath not our Author used this language of an *Objective* Infallibility himself in his 20th *Principle*, where he saith—*Assent doth not depend upon the objective infallibility of any thing without us*? Whereby it appears, himself hath a share in the *Jargon*. And what thinks he of that of his Archbishop *Laud*? ‖—‖ *We must distinguish of Infallibility. For first a thing may be presented as an infallible object of belief, when it is true and remains so*, &c. Doth not this make the Arch-bishop also one of the Jugglers he talks of? ‖ *p.* 125.

P. 80. *l.* (10.) *Infallible is that which cannot be deceived, Now, if no one will say, that a Proposition cannot be deceived, it is absurd to say; That it is infallibly true. Infallible is that which cannot be deceived.* I add, or, as applyed to *things*, is that, wherein we cannot be deceived: and so may *Propositions* be infallible. And is it then such a great absurdity to say; This proposition, *Homo est animal*, is infallibly true? Doth not himself say: the Scriptures are writings infallible? See his *Princ.* 12. And is not this, *infallibly true?*

P. 84. *l. ult. And being deceived*—In these two or three leaves the Dr hath been stating and fixing (as he saith) the *Notion* of *Infallibility* (where leaving the study of his notions to the understanding Reader) I shall only add these *notes* after it, (though the same hath been said already by *N.O.* and not taken notice of,) if they may serve to remedy any of his scruples and difficulties found herein. *N.* 1.

1. That a Christian hath always for the *Object* of his *Faith*, and that whereon it formally relies and finally rests, *Divine Revelation*, or *God's* own *Word*. Which Word of God is most absolutely infallible: and so to which as *infallible* (after whatever manner declared to him) the believer may most firmly adhere. *N.* 2.

2ly. That such things, as are proposed to him for Divine Revelation or God's Word, are so indeed (and among the rest, that of *Church-Infallibility* as assisted by the Holy Ghost, and *the Canon of Scripture*, both here believed infallible), the Believer is, or may be, antecedently, as to these, sufficiently assured from the *Tradition* thus commonly discribed, *viz.* the Testimony of a multitude in all ages of illustrious Persons qualified with the many *Motives* of *Credibility*, their *Wisdome*, *Sanctity*, *Martyrdomes*, their *N.* 3.

their being honoured with *Miracles*, relating things contrary to *carnal appetites* and their *ſecular intereſts*, *unanimous conſent* in ſo many ages *&c*, which *Tradition* carries a ſufficient ſelf-evidence in it: And that any further external and rational evidence of, or introductive to, his faith than that *Certainty*, whatever it be ſtiled, which this *Tradition* affords, no Chriſtian needs to have, or alſo can have antecedently to all the Articles of his Faith, unleſs God to atteſt them ſhould ſend a *Voice* from *Heaven*, or *Miracles*; and theſe ſo, as to be ſeen by every particular perſon. For, elſe, *Tradition* alſo muſt witneſs theſe *Miracles* to others. As likewiſe in the Apoſtle's dayes it is moſt credible, that the major part believed upon *Tradition*, without ſeeing *Miracles*. As for the *Certainty* which ſuch a *Tradition* yields us, if it be urged, that it is not ſuch, as the *Chriſtian* Faith neceſſarily requires for the ſuffering all manner of *deaths* and *Martyrdomes* in atteſtation of the truth thereof, namely an aſſurance or certainty *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, as this is taken in the moſt rigid ſenſe; we may here conſider, that neither ſuch would our certainty be, if we all had it, like to that of *S. Thomas* [*quia vidiſti credidiſti*], and believed *only* that which we firſt *ſaw* with our eyes. For, the Certainty of our Senſes (even when all things naturally required to a true ſenſation are preſent, and where no *Divine Revelation* diſcovers to us their mis-apprehenſion or mis-arguing collection, as it hath in the Angels their coming to *Sodom*) is not ſuch, *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, if taken in the higheſt ſenſe. For, if not by the ordinary power of Angels (God's permiſſion ſuppoſed), yet by the ſupernatural effects of the Divine Power all the ſenſes of the whole world at once poſſibly may be deceived, either by thinking they ſee thoſe colours, or other proper object of them which they do not; or, by collecting from theſe truly ſeen, ſomthing to be joined with, or the ſubject of, them, that is not ſo. As the men of *Sodom* were, and all the world might have been, deceived in the ſight of the truly-*Angels* their appearing *as Men* in their entring *Sodom*. Since then none deſires or needs a greater evidence of his faith, for example, concerning our Lord crucified, or riſen again, than Senſe may afford us, or S. *Thomas* by his Senſe had, conſequently muſt we not ſay, either that an evidence *cui poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, as this is taken in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, is abundantly ſufficient for a ground or Reaſon of faith; Or, that a ground of faith *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum* ought not to be taken in any higher notion than it is verifiable of our *Senſes*? And ſuch a Ground is the *Tradition* we ſpeak of; a ground *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, conſidering the *Nature* of *Man*; which Nature in ſuch

such a Tradition improved with such circumstances cannot have the least inclination or inducement to deliver or propagate to posterity so *general* an *Untruth*.

3ly. That an *infallible assent* is said, in a *Divine Faith*, to be yielded to Divine Revelation or Gods word, as well by *Protestants*, as *Catholicks*; See Archbishop *Laud* p. 360. where he saith——*That* A.C. *concludes well, that an infallible certainty is necessary for that one faith which is necessary to salvation. And of that* [faith, saith he] *a most infallible certainty we have already in the Scripture, the Creeds* &c: And again see p. 330. where he saith—— *I believe the entire Scripture infallibly, and by a Divine infallibility am sure of my object*: and below——*that he is infallibly assured of his Creed.* So that, if hence any difficulties press the *Catholicks* in the Resolution of Faith, how they come to yield an infallible assent thereto, the same do the *Protestants*. Now by such *infallible assent*, asserted by both, I say, may either be meant, *N.* 4.

1. An Assent grounded on the Infallibility that the forenamed Tradition affords; being the greatest *self-evident* testimony of a thing past, as, of that which our Lord and his Apostles did, said, or writ, that can be had, except *Miracles*. [Of the *infallibility* of which *Tradition* thus the Archbishop ‖——*A man may be assured, nay infallibly assured, by Ecclesiastical and Humane proof. Men that never saw* Rome *may be sure and infallibly believe, that such a City there is by Historical and acquired faith.* And in the next page——*Certain it is* (saith he) *that by humane authority consent and proof a man may be assured infallibly, that Scripture is the word of God.*]. *N.* 5. ‖ *p.* 124.

2. Or, by *infallible Assent* is meant an Assent yielded to an Object that, as being Gods owne word, is believed to be most supremely Infallible and immutable. [As the Archbishops words seem to explain themselves where he saith——† *That Faith is an evidence as well as knowledge; and the belief is firmer than any knowledge can be, because it rests upon Divine authority, which cannot deceive.* And so Dr *Potter* ‖——*The assent of Faith is more certain* (*if it be possible*) *than that of Sense, or Science, or Demonstration, because it rests on Divine Authority which cannot possibly deceive.* And, as some Catholicks also explain themselves; when they say that no *Divine* Faith without an *infallible* assent; *i.e.* an assent to an *object* that is most infallible, *Gods Word*; not without a *Proponent* or Expositor of the sense of this Word, where ambiguous, that is also really infallible. And thus, they say, the *illiterate* and *vulgar* sort among Catholicks are *infallible* in the assent they give to the Articles of their Faith, not *formally*, by an infallible knowledge or certainty *N.* 6. † *p.* 86. ‖ *p.* 199.

certainty that the thing, or person, they believe is so true or infallible; but *materially*, by their adherence to that which is a reall truth: who therefore, from the *Object* of their Faith, Gods Word, and the *Proponent* of the sense of it, where disputed, *viz.* the Church, being both *infallible*, are alwayes actually preserved from erring in their Faith, (though all such persons are not *infallibly certain* either of the Object of their faith, that it is Gods Word; or, of the Proponent, that he is not liable to errour): whilst on the other side a *Protestant* having or believing no such certain and infallible *Guide* in the Sense of *doubtful* Scriptures, and following his *own judgment* in the interpretation of them, either actually errs in some *part* of his *Faith*, or casually hits right, and fluctuates to and fro; the same man, as he meets with several arguments, differing from himself, and one from another, in those matters, wherein all Subjects to the Church's Authority are agreed. To which purpose a late Adversary of the Doctor's perceiving him to mistake the meaning of Catholicks in the former proposition, explains himself in *Errour Non-plust*, p.133. 139. 143. &c. the same Author meanwhile affirming; that all Catholicks may be, and that the learned are, *formally infallible* in their assent to the object of their faith: *i.e.* have an infallible certainty of the Infallibility both of the *Scripture* and the *Proponent* thereof; *viz.* from *Tradition*; the evidence of which Tradition is accounted by him to be impossible to be false, but so also it is (as to this Author's sense of *impossible*) by Archbishop *Lawd* p. 124. but now cited. And perhaps, *Infallible Assent* thus taken by *Catholicks* in a various sense occasions the Dr's apprehending in them contradictions.]

N. 7. [3] Or, by this *infallible Assent* may be meant an Assent in respect of the *Subject* having a *Certitude* of *Adhesion* to the matters believed exceeding that to *a Science*, according to that of *Biel* cited by the Archbishop ||—*Scientia certior est certitudine evidentiæ, fides verò certior firmitate adhæsionis. Majus lumen in scientiâ, majus robur in fide.*

|| p. 75.

N. 8. Now, How proper these expressions be in the explaining of an *infallible Assent*, and whether these two last Notions are not coincident, I meddle not. But, however it be, by such *infallible assent* is never meant an assent grounded on any *absolutely-infallible Testimony* that the Revelation is Divine, transcending that of Tradition, and equalling that believed infallibility of the *Church* (the Church I mean as assisted by the *Holy Ghost*, and as its *infallibility as to necessaries* is one of the Articles of our Faith), or equalling that believed infallibility of the *Scriptures*. Which *Testimony*, (were there any such absolutely infallible), must either

either be proved by other *Testimonies* of an equal weight *in infinitum*; or must rest in some one that is a *per se notum*. I say, an infallible assent so grounded Catholicks pretend not; nor need pretend to. The Church in *necessaries*, the Holy Scriptures in *all* things are *believed*, are affirmed, to be infallible by an infallibility *cui non potest subesse falsum*, because *believed* Divine Revelation, (and so are adhered-to as such by a firmer and constanter assent than Sense or science causeth:) but are not, need not to be, *infallibly known* to be so, as to any rational or demonstrative evidence, by any infallibility transcending that of the forementioned Tradition, whereever *Miracles* do not intervene. Which infallibility or certainty of Tradition is abundantly sufficient to render and represent the *Christian* the most *rational* Religion in the world.

This, that no other precedent Testimony is necessary for proving the Infallibility of the Church, as it is effectually assisted by the Holy Ghost in necessaries, than that of *Tradition*. But neither do Catholicks affirm it necessary, that *every one*, for a *Divine* or saving Faith, have that certainty of faith that Tradition affords. And to see that this is no Paradox among Catholicks, I referr the Reader to what *F. Bacon* hath said of it in his *Analysis Fidei* extracted out of other *Catholick Authors*, Disp. 3. c. 7. and 8. Though it is affirmed necessary in the Catholick Church, that It always have a most rational and certain proof of the truth of the *Christian* Faith, and such as no other false or *Heretical* Religion can equall. *N.* 9.

4ly. That, notwithstanding such a sufficient rational assurance and actual certainty in *Tradition*; and so in the *infallibility* of the *Scriptures* too, as to the most part of the *Canon* thereof, sufficiently attested by the same *Tradition*, Yet remains there still a great necessity also of the *Infallibility* in the *Governours* of the *Church*, so assisted by the Holy Ghost as never to err in *Necessaries*, upon a manifold account. *N.* 10.

'Because, though many are, yet *all* Points of *Faith* are not, delivered and transferred to Posterity by the forementioned Tradition in their *express* and explicit termes; but some have only descended in their Principles: the necessary Deductions from which are by this *Infallible* Church extracted and vindicated from age to age, against those dangerous *errours* that may happen to assault them. 'Again, Because, though this Tradition is also assisted or improved, with the Infallible Scriptures for a compleater direction in the Christian Faith, yet are not all *Credends* and *Agends* so clearly delivered in these *Scriptures*, as that Christians, the *illiterate* especially and *plebeians*, have no need of such an Interpreter thereof, *N.* 11.

thereof, as may not miſtake or miſguide them in any ſuch *neceſſary* Agends, or Credends. To which unlearned perſons though it is ſaid not to be neceſſary, that they be *infallibly certain* of the truth of that which they believe; and therefore *Church-Infallibility* cannot be ſaid neceſſary as to them upon this account; yet it is neceſſary to them, that, in ſuch points where one of the two contradictories is of neceſſary faith, it be *truth* that they believe; and hence neceſſary alſo that the *Proponent* thereof be *infallible*, as to all ſuch points. And it is here obſervable, that, though in the Deſcent of Tradition the *Congregatio fidelium*, when it firſt delivers to a perſon the Infallibility of Church and of *Scripture*, appears not to him as yet abſolutely infallible; Yet indeed as to delivering *neceſſaries* it then, and always, is ſo: For, this *Congregatio fidelium* in every age that teſtifies ſuch things, It, or ſome part of it, is the very ſame Body that is promiſed by our Lord his perpetual aſſiſtance, and is preſerved for ever by Gods Spirit and Providence from erring in Neceſſaries. [3] Again, Becauſe the ſame *Church-Infallibility* is neceſſary, as to other Controverſies, ſo alſo to thoſe, if any happen, concerning the *Canon* of *Scripture*, ſo far as any part thereof hath hapned in ſome times not to have had in all parts of Chriſtianity ſo clear a current of *Tradition*. [4] Becauſe, after this point of *Church-Infallibility* is once eſtabliſhed and confirmed by ſuch Tradition, one may hence ſooner and eaſilier learn his faith from her plain definitions and propoſals thereof, than from *Tradition* much diſperſed abroad, whereby its uniformity is the harder to be diſcerned; or from the *Scriptures*, in ſeveral points not ſo perſpicuous, and ſo the more ſubject to misinterpretations; and where, for the thorow ſtudying the one or the other, the *vocations* and employments of moſt Chriſtians admit not a competent *vacancy*. [5] Laſtly, the Queſtions that tend to *void* Church-Infallibility from the *ſufficiency* of Tradition may as well ſerve for rendring uſeleſs the Infallibility of *Scripture* on the ſame account: and the ſame Queſtion that demands, Why the *Church* is *believed* more infallible than *Tradition*, which Church-Infallibility is proved only by Tradition, may as well be put concerning the *Scriptures*; Why theſe held more infallible than Tradition, the ſtrongeſt proof of which Infallibility of Scriptures among Proteſtants is from it.

Annota-

Annotations on his §. 3. of N.O's *Concessions.*

PAge 85. l. 14. N.O. yields, *That there is no necessity at all of Infallibility under natural Religion.* 'There are no words so put together in the Doctor's 2*d* and 3*d Principle* conceded by *N.O:* but by taking his own *Principles* in what sense he pleaseth he may represent *N.O's Concessions* of them what he pleaseth. 'If by what he saith *N.O.* yields he means this (see his *p.*86. *l.*5.) That we may have a sufficient certainty of some *Principles* in *Religion*, without, or antecedently to, the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, as it is assisted by Gods Spirit first known to us, it is willingly granted him. But meanwhile, from the *Beginning*, besides the *Law* of *Nature* teaching in general the Worship of a God, there were also *Positive* Divine Laws concerning his Service conserved in that Body which constituted his Visible Church. So we finde early in *Genesis*, mention of *Sacrifice, Firstlings, Holocausts, Peace-offerings, clean and unclean beasts, birds in Sacrifice not divided, not eating the bloud*; *mention of Holy Times, Places, Persons, Priests, Prophets*; *of Tithes paid to the Priest, Purifyings, Cleansings, changing their garments, Vows*; *Prohibition of Polygamy* (as we may gather from Matt. 16. 4, 8.) *of contracting Marriages with unbelievers*, as may be gathered from Gen. 6. 2, compared with 1. *Excommunication* or expulsion out of the Church, as we may gather from Gen. 4. 12, 14, 16. And these *Laws* we may presume were received from an *infallible* external *Proponent*, and were preserved by the Ecclesiastical Superiours and Teachers of these laws in such a manner as those delivered since: and for the certainty of Religion, there seems an infallibility in these as necessary, if not more, for solving the great doubts arising therein before, as after, the times of a *Written* Law. These *laws* and *statutes* are made mention of, *Gen.* 26. 5. when God promised his blessing upon *Isaac* and his seed; *because that* Abraham *had obeyed his voice and kept his Precepts and Commandments, observed his Ceremonies and Laws*: Whose Service had been performed more publickly and solemnly from the times of *Enos* ||, and after that the days of *Adam* were half run out. And of these Positive Laws, and the Tradition of them, and of these Ecclesiastical Superiors, thus S. *Alba-* † *De Synod.*
nasius †, ——*Quæ* Moses *docuit eadem ab* Abrahamo *observata sunt*; *Nicen. Decretis.*
Quæ porrò Abraham *observavit eadem* Noe & Enoch *agnoverunt*
——Abel *quoque hujus rei testis habendus est, qui ea, quæ ab* Adam *perceperat, Deo obtulit*; Adam *autem Magisterio Dei instructus fuit.* || *Gen.*4.26.

Pag. 86. *l.* 8. *He yields, That Reason is to be Judge concerning Divine Revelation. i. e.* as I understand him, *Judge*, whether that which is pretended, be a true, Divine Revelation: or, if such, *Judge* again, what is the true *Sense* of it. To this I say; 1. That, whereas He collects this from *N.O.'s* granting his 4th *Principle*, there is no mention at all of *Reason* in this 4th Principle, from which this Author deduceth such a Concession. 2. That *N.O.* upon the Dr's 5th. *Principle*, hath delivered the just contrary to this Concession imposed upon him, in these very words ‖——*Here, if the Dr means, that every Christian hath a faculty in him, which as to all Revelations whatsoever proposed to him can discern the true and Divine from others that are not so; and, when a Revelation certainly Divine is capable of several senses, can discern the true sense from the false, and all this exclusively to, and independently on, the instruction of Church-Authority: This Proposition is not true. For then, none will need, (as experience shews they do) to repair to any other Teacher for instructing him in a dubious Revelation, or the sense of any Divine Revelation controverted, which is the true, Revelation; or which is the Sense of it.* 3. Yet however, this shall be granted him in relation to that Principle, that nothing ought to be admitted for *Divine Revelation* which overthrows the certainty of, or is contradictory to, *true Reason*. But, if the Revelation be of somthing *above* Reason, *Reason* may be no fit *Judge* of it.

‖ *Consid. p.* 6

Ibid. l. (12). *He yields, That the will of God may be sufficiently declared to men by writing.* This and the following Concession *That the written will of God doth contain all things simply necessary to Salvation* I have re-considered, and find no advantage to our Author's cause from *N.O's* yielding them.

Pag. 87 l. (9.). *But he quarrels* &c. Whether the Dr's *consequence Princip.* 21. drawn by him from what was said *Princip.* 20. be well deduced, or no (which is called *N.O's* quarrel here) I appeal to any judicious Reader, reviewing these *Principles* after this our Author's defence.

Pag. 88. *l.* 11. *As for instance, that the Church is infallible, is in the first place to be believed upon their principles.* Their Principles affirm no such thing &c. See *N.O. Consid.* pag. 37. saying the contrary, in these words——*A Christians faith may begin either at the infallible Authority of Scriptures, or of the Church: and this infallible Authority of either of these be learnt from Tradition, and that of the other from it.*

Ibid. l. (10.) *The Ground on which a Necessity of some external infallible Proponent is asserted must rather make every particular person infallible, If no divine faith can be without an infallible assent*

assent; and so renders any other Infallibility useless. Any infallible assent, necessary to the right believing this Article of our faith *the Church's Infallibility*, more than that which Tradition affords, *N.O.* affirms not. See what the Dr puts in the next page for *N.O.'s* 6th Concession. As for the Dr's arguing here; *The ground on which &c.*, it is not good. For, every particular person's being, antecedently, infallibly assured, *i.e.* by Tradition, of this particular point of faith *that the Church is Infallible*, renders not at all the Church's Infallibility useless as to the same person his being assured of several *other* points of faith only by the *Church's Infallibility*, which (according as the person's condition needs instruction) may both ascertain him of many more points of Faith, and more clearly ascertain them to him than Tradition doth.

Ibid. l. (3.) *Our only Question is about Infallibility, whether that be necessary or no?* Writing thus in general is full of ambiguities. *Whether infallibility be necessary*; means he, Whether Church-Infallibility be necessary at all? Notwithstanding that a sufficient certainty from *Tradition* sufficeth for our being assured of such *Infallibility* in the Church? See this Question, I think, sufficiently solved in the Note on pag. 84. l. ult. n 4. Or means he, Whether an *absolutely infallible* Testimony be antecedently necessary for knowing or rightly believing the *Infallibility* of the Church? If so, such infallible Testimony is affirmed not necessary, unless he will allow *Tradition* such.

Ib. l. ult. If sufficiently certain evidence will serve for the Church's infallibility, why may it not for the Scriptures, or any matters of faith contained therein? It may, where it can be had. See *N.O.'s Concess.* 6. in the Dr's p. 89.

Pag. 89. l. 3. *If they mean no more by infallibility than sufficient certainty*, &c. Catholicks by *Church-Infallibility* as assisted with *Gods Spirit* mean more than a *Moral* Certainty, such Church-infallibility being affirmed a Divine Revelation, and so believed to be *absolutely* infallible: And affirm, Christians in such Necessary Points of Faith, where neither the sense of *Scripture*, nor of *Tradition*, is clear, and doth afford sufficient certainty, without this *Church-Infallibility* to be no way secure from errour.

Ibid. l. 7. We all say matters of faith have sufficient certainty. What, that all matters of faith have sufficient *certainty* as to us, if Church-Infallibility be excluded; as it is, by Protestants? I ask, from what have we this certainty? From the *Scripture?* How this, where its *Sense* is *doubtful*, and controverted, as in the Text; *Hoc est Corpus meum*? From *Tradition*? But all Necessary Points of Faith are not in such clear and expres terms delivered by *It*, that no

no Christian can have any reasonable doubt therein.

Ibid. l. (12.) *I only desire to know, why a like right and saving faith may not be had concerning the Scriptures, without their Church's infallibility?* A Catholick may have a right and saving Faith concerning the *Scriptures* (I suppose, their being the *Word* of *God*), or concerning any other Article of Faith clearly delivered in them, without such a person's being infallibly assured of *Church-Infallibility*; but without Church-Infallibility cannot have a certain and unerring faith as to those points that are not so *clearly* set down in *Scripture*, but that some persons may mistake; or also, as to those Books of Scripture that are not so *clearly* attested by *Tradition*; or, this Tradition not easily *knowable* to such person.

Ib. l. (9.) *From hence it follows, that an infallible assent is not requisite to saving faith*; *directly contrary to my former adversary E.W.* Whatever difference may be amongst Catholicks concerning What assurance of their faith in some Catholicks is necessary to salvation, yet all agree, that all Catholicks may have a sufficient certainty of their faith from Church-Infallibility; which sufficient certainty (for, this serves our turn as to this Author's *Principles*) *Protestants* cannot have in many points thereof; as relying on their *own Judgment* in the Sense of *dubius* Scriptures, and not on the *Definitions* of the *Church*. See before Note on pag. 84 l. ult.

Pag. 90. *l.* 7. *He yields That the utmost assurance*, &c. *N.O.'s* words p. 56. that he referrs to, are—*Any person may be, and that antecedently to the testimony of Scripture, at least with a morally-infallible certainty* (*or whatever certainty that may be called, which Universal Tradition can afford*) *assured of this Divine Revelation, the Church's Infallibility, from such Tradition and other Motives of Credibility, as Protestants allow for a sufficiently or morally infallible and certain means of believing the Scriptures to be the word of God.* Here is no mention of [*utmost*].

Ib. l. (5.) *It* [moral Infallibility] *is joining two words together which destroy each other.* Surely the Author, in such passages as these, studies some recreation for his Reader, or some relief of the Stationer in an age given so much to jests, even in the most grave and serious subjects. *NO*, before he writ these *Considerations* on his *Principles*, found him in this merry Critical humour, in his *Rational Account*. Where pag. 154. the Replier to the Archbishop saying, *that the Church's infallibility must come from the Holy Ghost, and so be more than humane and moral*; He falls on descanting thus upon it—*You tell us very wisely that this infallibility*

lity is not a thing that is not infallible. And——*It is well you tell us of ſuch a rare diſtinction of infallibility; for elſe, I aſſure you we had never thought of it*, viz. *of an infallibility that may be deceived.* Thus He. But forgetting the like language in the Archbiſhop whom he defends. The Archbiſhops words p. 124. are——*If you ſpeak of aſſurance only in the general, I muſt then tell you* (*and it is the great advantage which the Church of Chriſt hath againſt Infidels*) *a man may be aſſured, nay infallibly aſſured by Eccleſiaſtical and humane proof. Men that never ſaw* Rome *may be ſure, and infallibly believe, that ſuch a City there is, by Hiſtorical and acquired Faith. And if conſent of humane Story can aſſure me this, why ſhould not conſent of Church-Story aſſure me the other?* [Now what is this but *Moral Infallibility?*] And ſo Mr *Chillingworth* ‖——*We are and may be infallibly certain that we are to believe the Chriſtian Religion* [i.e. from the more reaſonable Grounds we have for it, than for any other]. And I find our Author himſelf in the ſame *Rational Account* p. 96. where this Critical humour was not ſo violent, and where he had ſome inducement to advance the credit of a *Moral Certainty*, treating this term [Infallible] a little more gently. ——*If by infallible certainty* (ſaith he there) *you mean only ſuch as excludes all poſſibility of reaſonable doubting upon the conſideration of the validity and ſufficiency of that teſtimony I am to believe the Canon of Scripture upon; then I aſſent* &c. And p. 197.——*Thus we ſee how impoſſible it is to avoid a Circle in the ſuppoſition of a ſupernatural Infallibility in the Church's Tradition. But if no more be meant but a kind of rational Infallibility* (*though thoſe terms be not very proper*) i.e. *ſo great evidence, as, if I queſtion it, I may, upon equal grounds, queſtion every thing which mankind yields the firmeſt aſſent to, becauſe I cannot imagine, that ſo great a part of the wiſeſt, and moſt conſiderative part of the world ſhould be ſo groſly deceived in a matter of ſuch moment* (*eſpecially ſuppoſing a Divine Providence*) *then I freely and heartily aſſert, We have ſuch a kind of rational infallibility; or rather the higheſt degree of actual certainty concerning the truth of the Canon of Scripture; and that the Catholick Church hath not* de facto *erred in defining it.* But, without all this defence, our Author knowing *N.O.'s* meaning, what needs he quarrel about his words, unleſs it were to gain this poor victory, that *N.O.* hath in ſomething ſpoken improperly? But one material thing here may be obſerved by the Reader; that this *moral Infallibility*, where mentioned by *N.O.* is always applied to the ſaid *Tradition* viz. the *Teſtimony* of ſo great a multitude of learned and pious men: but never to *Church-Infallibility* as a Body aſſiſted with the *Holy Ghoſt*; which Church is always believed not *non-morally* only,

‖ p. 330.

ly, but *non-possibly*, fallible; as also other Articles of the Christian Faith are, as being all *Divine* Revelations: but these certainly known or proved, by a rational evidence, to be Divine Revelations, only from *Tradition*. And Lastly that *N.O.* in his applying *Moral Infallibility* to Tradition, leaving every one to express it otherwise, adds; *or, whatever certainty that may* be called, which Tradition affords. ‖ ‖*Consi. p.* 56.

Pag. 91. *l.* 6. *This were well enough, If in the precedent page he had not said* &c. *An infallible assent* in the former page, and a *morally-Infallible assent*, whereby in the latter it is explained, do not contradict.

Ib. l. 7. *Had not said, That a particular person may be infallible in his assent.* That is, *sufficiently infallible*, as *N.O.* explains himself afterward, and the Dr confesseth it.

Ib. l. 14. *I would fain understand, if the Evidence be only sufficiently or morally infallible, How the assent which is built upon it comes to be more than so.* Any *assent* that is built only upon a sufficiently or *morally infallible* evidence never comes to be more than so. *Assensus cognoscitivus non excedit Certitudinem Principii, quo nititur.* See Note on p. 84. l. ult. n. 2.

Ib. l. 17. *Late Writers of their Church are perplexed about this word Infallibility.* Our Author frames to himself strange Chimera's of *Infallibility*, notwithstanding the pains taken by Catholicks to undeceive him and others therein: whenas the Infallibility maintained by Catholicks is only that of the *Church Catholick* in a *General Council* in the defining of *necessaries*. For the proving of which *Infallibility*, they urge the Practice of former General Councils (approved by the whole Catholick Church), defining such points; and putting them into the *Creeds*; and anathematizing any *Dissenters*. Behold now this terrible monster of *Infallibility*, which this Author saith—*Mr* Cr. *and other late Roman Writers retain like a wolf by the ears, cannot tell how to hold it, and are afraid to let it go*; *and* N.O. *at last quitting the thing contents himself with the sound of it.* And yet a few pages hence p. 95. the Dr tells you, that the first *Principle N.O.* sets up in opposition to his, is this *Infallibility* viz. *That God hath given an infallible assistance to the Guides of the Church in all ages of it, for the direction of those who live in it.*

Ib. l. (10.) *Loth to part with the sound of Infallibility.* See Note on p. 90. l. (5).

Ib. l. (6.) *He yields, that moral certainty is a sufficient foundation for Faith.* Such terms neither occur in the Dr's 27th *Proposition*, here referred to as conceded by *N.O.* nor in any words

words of *N.O.* nor any thing equivalent to them, without some qualifications annexed. The proper *Foundation* of a Christian's Faith, or that on which it mainly relies is *Gods word*, or Divine Revelation. But, if it be asked concerning the *rational Certainty* that Christians have, or may have, that such as they believe to be, truly are, Divine Revelations, this is affirmed to be the Certainty, which the *Tradition* so often forementioned affords: call this Certainty by what name any one will. This Tradition, as the Reader may find in the Dr's next page, is said by *N.O.* (for which citation *N.O.* is obliged to the Dr that his Reader may sometimes at least find *N.O.'s* tenents in his own words) to be the first *rational introductive* of our *Faith*. And is so acknowledged not only by *N.O.* but generally I think by the whole Christian world, at least by all Catholick Controvertists. And yet our Author gazeth upon it as a new coined Position; and frequently also calls it *yielding the cause*. It is necessary to mistake or misrepresent the Catholicks Tenents, thus to have something to say against them.

Pag. 93. *l.* (11.) *By which he fairly gives up the cause of Infallibility, as to the necessity of it in order to faith.* I ask, of what *Infallibility*? *Church*-Infallibility? *N.O.'s* next words following those quoted here by the Dr out of p. 67. are these—*But, notwithstanding this, Christians may be deficient in a right belief of several necessary Articles of this Christian Faith, if destitute of that External Infallible Guide therein. And the perpetual Divine Assistance, and so Infallibility, in necessaries, of this Guide being declared in the Scriptures, a Catholick having once learnt this point of Faith, from its definitions and expositions becomes secure and settled in the belief of all those controverted Articles of his faith, wherein others, steered only by themselves, do fluctuate, totter and vary one from another, whilst the Scriptures in such points (at least to persons unlearned or of weaker judgments, which are the greatest part of Christians) are ambiguous in their sense, and drawn with much art to several Interests.* See before Note on p. 84. l. ult. n 4. And I ask, Will it follow from Dr *St's* holding a moral certainty of *Tradition* to be a sufficient introductive to believing the Canon, or Infallibility, of Scriptures, that he therefore gives up the Canon or the *Infallibility* of *Scripture*, as to any necessity of it in order to matters of faith? If not; neither doth *N.O.* give up *Church-Infallibility*. Or means he, gives up the *cause* of an *absolute* Infallibility its being necessary *ex parte subjecti* to the having a right faith? *N.O.* doth so; yields it up, as not being the Catholicks *cause*, and stands to it: but so doth he also yield up this of a *moral* infallibility *ex*

parte subjecti its being necessary to *every* one for having a right faith.

Pag. 94. *l.* (12.) *I desire N.O.* and *E.W. to agree better*, &c. Perhaps what is said before in Note on p. 84. n. 3. may satisfy our Author in this matter. If not, the Reverend Person *E.W.* (if it be though fit) is able to give a much better account of himself, than *N.O.* to whom therefore with all respect he leaves it. But this I say (and let the Reader judge) that, if this Author gives no fairer account of *E.W.*'s propositions, than he doth of *N.O.*'s, his Reader hath little reason to credit other mens Positions upon his Relation: who, by his first changing *N.O.*'s notions, and then confuting them, puts him to the trouble of these reflections.

Ib. l. (6.) *N.O. here makes moral certainty a sufficient ground for Divine Faith.* See Note on p. 91. *l.* (6.)

Pag. 95. *l.* 11. *By these Concessions it appears that the Cause of Infallibility is clearly given up*, &c. No. See Note on p. 93. *l.* (11.)

Annotations on his §. 4. Touching N.O.'s Principles.

PAg. 95. *l.* (4.) The Doctor represents *N.O.*'s Principles thus. 1. *That God hath given an infallible assistance to the Guides of the Church in all ages of it, for the direction of those who live in it.* Add here, as to all *Necessaries*. For, it is thus frequently limited by *N.O.*; but such limitation every where omitted by Dr *St.*

Pag. 96. *l.* 1. 2. *That without this infallible assistance there can be no certainty of the sense of Scripture.* *No certainty*; add, as to *all Christians*: many of whom are unlearned, yong, or of small capacity. *Of the sense of Scripture*; add, as to *several* points of *faith Necessary*; not, as to *all*. For *N.O.* doth not deny the sense of Scripture as to several points of faith clear enough, and amongst rational men not disputed. Adde, I say, these; and *N.O.* will own the Proposition.

Ibid. l. 3. 3. *That all the arguments which overthrow the Church's Infallibility do destroy the Church's Authority.* There is no such thing said by *N.O.* Nay; the contrary is often said by him: that, *Church Infallibility* being destroyed, yet the *Church's Authority*, though fallible, may upon many reasons justly challenge submission of judgement to her Decrees from her Subjects.

See

ee *N.O.* p. 18. 26. 48. 50. and in the former Diſcourſe §. 35. 37. 39. But this is ſaid by *N.O.* and muſt be ſtill, till the Dr better clears himſelf, That ſome Arguments uſed by the Dr againſt *Church-Infallibility* are as ſtrong, and ſtronger, againſt *Church-Authority*: as namely, that made in his 19th Principle, if any one pleaſe to read there [*Authority*] inſtead of [*Infallibility.*]

Ib. l. 16. *If God hath not given an infallible aſſiſtance to the Guides of the Church, the Principles laid down by me muſt hold.* No. For, *private* judgments ought to ſubmit to *Church-Authority*, though *fallible*, in all ſuch points wherein ſuch private perſons have not *demonſtration* againſt it: much more, if commanded to obey this authority, and to *follow its faith.* So, where no *infallible* aſſiſtance, yet we prudently ſubmit our judgment to the advice of a more knowing friend; and *Children* to the precepts and injunctions of their *Parents*, though theſe fallible, and that by the Divine command; not enjoining them hereby to believe a lye or practiſe things unlawful, but only to believe that to be *moſt credibly* true or juſt, which their Parents and Superiours, much wiſer than themſelves, inform them to be ſo; And where, if there be ſome *incertainty* in following *their* Judgments, this is not leſſe, but more, in following *their own.* Men rightly ſubmit their Judgments to perſons and things *moſt credible*, as well as to the abſolutely *infallible.*

Ib. l. (9) *We do not diſpute concerning the beſt helps for a perſon to make uſe of in a matter of this nature.* Whereas our Author here calls for the beſt helps a man can get, naming theſe, *the directions of his Paſtor, the decrees of Councils, the ſenſe of the Primitive Church*, for the right underſtanding the Scriptures; if he means in *neceſſaries*, I appeal to the candid Reader, whether the *Reaſon* given by him in his *Principles*, for which he ſaith the ſober enquirer cannot miſtake in Neceſſaries, doth not argue ſuch *helps* needleſs, namely this (*Princip.* 15.) —*Becauſe the whole will of God is in the Scriptures ſo plainly revealed, that no ſober enquirer can miſs of what is neceſſary to ſalvation; ſo that there can be no neceſſity ſuppoſed of any infallible* [I add, much leſs of any fallible] *ſociety of men either to atteſt or explain theſe writings.* So he then. Which argues either no need of ſuch *Helps*; or, if theſe uſefull, ſuch *Scriptures* without them not *clear.* And therefore, if ſuch *Helps* are to be repaired to for the true meaning of ſuch Scriptures in Neceſſaries, they ought to have been included in his *Principle.* 'But then, the Quality or Profeſſion and Condition of the farr greater part of Chriſtians ſeems no way capable of uſing all ſuch Helps:' Or, if they were, yet all theſe helps being

held by him *fallible*, they will ſtill, after theſe, be liable to *errour* in *neceſſary* faith. *All* Chriſtians, then, as to *all* neceſſaries to ſalvation, are not free from erring, without an infallibility, in theſe points, of their *Guides*; neither the *Scriptures* being clear in theſe without Helps; nor the *Helps* in them, unliable to miſtakes.

Pag. 97. *l.* 6. *The decrees of Councils, the ſenſe of the primitive Church.* Surely, ſuch are not only *helps*, for *inſtruction* of Chriſtians; but *laws*, for *Obedience*.

Ib. l. 11. *The foundation of this perſon's faith can be nothing elſe but a trembling quickſand.* The *Foundation* laid by the Dr, & thus expreſſed in his preface by *N.O.* viz.—*An Errability in Neceſſaries of the Guides of God's Church; an Inerrability in the ſame by him attributed indefinitly to all ſober Chriſtians, who, without any neceſſary conſulting and depending on their Teachers inſtituted for that by God, ſhall uſe their ſincere endeavors to find out ſuch Truths*, is rightly affirmed by *N.O.* (Pref. p. 4.) to be but a *tottering* and trembling foundation of their *Faith*.

N.O's words. *Ib. l.* 17. *The only certain way not to be miſ-led* [I add, where the ſenſe of Scripture or Tradition is to any ambiguous] *will be the ſubmitting our internal aſſent and belief to Church-Authority.* This is aſſerted.

Ib. l. (9) *Here then two Queſtions neceſſarily ariſe.* 1. *Whether there can be no certainty of faith* [i.e, in ſeveral points of Faith, where the ſenſe of Scripture or Tradition is to any ambiguous and diſputed] *without this Church-Infallibility?* 2. *What certainty there is of this Church Infallibility?* The 1ſt. is affirmed. The 2d is ſpoken to below in Annot. on p. 113. *l.* 14.

Pag. 89. *l.* 3. *Every man hath in him a faculty of diſcerning truth and falſhood.* What, in all things of *faith*, by his own ſole ability? No. Some *helps*, I hope, he muſt have in ſeveral things, as, *Directions of his Paſtor, the ſenſe of the Primitive Church, Decrees of Councils*, as our Author ſaith, p. 96.

Annotations on his §. 5. N.O's Exceptions anſwered.

Pag. 98. *l.* (6) *The Queſtion now is: whether a perſon not relying on the Infallibility of a Church, may not be certain of thoſe things which are contained in the Scriptures in order to Salvation?* Of ſome of theſe he may, becauſe there contained *plainly* enough; of others not; where rational Judgments diſpute the ſenſe.

Ib. l. (5)

Ib. l. (3) *Our enquiry is, not about the sense of the more difficult &c.* But *N.O.* is. Several points *Necessary* are *difficult* to *many* and controverted: witness those contained in the *Athanasian* Creed.

Pag. 99. *l. ult. I desire to know, whether things simply necessary ought not to be delivered with greater plainness, than things which are not so?* No. But so, as God pleaseth; so he provide other ways for the explaining of what is obscure.

Pag. 100. *l.* 6. *Whether our Saviours own Sermons were capable of being understood by those, who heard them.* How capable soever of being understood, they *were* not understood, he said, by all his Auditors, in every thing; nor by his own Diciples.

Ib. l. (5) *Or can we have now no certainty of the meaning of the Levitical Law, because there is no High Priest or Sanhedrin to explain it?* Not all Persons, in all things, without an Explainer. And there was anciently a Guide Infallible, or so authorized as that all were to stand to its judgment, appointed for deciding several doubtful parts of *Moses* his *Law*. Of which see in the former Discourse §. 22.

Pag. 101. *l.* (8). *Yet, after all, he cannot certainly understand the meaning of them.* Not of *some* of them, exclusively to an *Infallible* Church-Authority, and his Submission thereto.

Pag. 102. *l.* 10. *And after all this cannot we understand &c?* That every one cannot without some other helps than only our Lord's and his Apostles discourses, I think this Authour grants before p. 96. 97. And —*Sic, oportebat, ut diceretur, quod non ab omnibus intelligeretur*, saith S. *Austin* || of our Lord's Sermon about the Eucharist in the 6th of S. *John*. || *In Joan. tract.* 27.

Ibid. l. (7). *Our Question is not about may be's.* Therefore *N.O.* in those *Considerations* on *Princip.* 13. p. 14. *&c*, contends, that God not only *may*, but *hath* so revealed his mind that in many things it is clear to some persons, when not to others; and for this quotes Dr *Field* on his side.

Ib. l. (5). *It is taken for granted on both sides, that God hath revealed his mind in writing.* But not granted, that he hath revealed it so clearly in writing, as *none* may mistake *any part* of it. I am afraid I tire out the Reader with so often *repetition* of the same limitations and restrictions, applied to a discourse that renders it self plausible by omitting them. The rule of *Indefinite* Terms and propositions is a sure way, and a fine art, for *Controvertists* to answer one another, and both speak truth. So these two: *Scriptures are clear in points of necessary faith*, and *Scriptures are not clear in points of necessary faith*, are both very true

true as to *several persons*, and in *several matters* of necessary faith.

Pag. 103. *l.* 14. *But when I had expresly said things necessary for salvation, why doth he avoid that which the dispute was about, and only say, many things?* It was an oversight in *N.O.* but no advantage made by it; who in speaking of the *clearness* of Scriptures adds the term *as to Necessaries* frequently, and that in the *Consideration* upon the very same *Principle*. [See p. 15.—*If these in all necessaries are clear,—Of every particular Christian in all points necessary—Such a clearness in Necessaries must the Scripture have*, &c.] By which the Reader may see whether his Adversary had cause to complain: but so doth not the Dr, when speaking of Church Infallibility, add this term *as to necessaries*, used by *N.O.*

Ib. l. (10). *I never yet saw one difficulty removed by the pretended infallible Guides of the Church.* *General Councils* are these pretended *Infallible Guides*: and the *doubted* and disputed *Sense* of many Scriptures in necessary matters have been *cleared* by these *Councils*, and some of them put in the Church's *Creeds*.

Pag. 104. *l.* 8. *Nothing of it* [their talent of infallibility] *ever appeared above ground.* See the last Note.

Ib. l. 15. *Supposing we believe their Infallibility, we are still as far to seek, for the meaning of many difficult places.* The *Church* is not said to be infallible in *all* things *whatever*, as the Scriptures are; but, in *necessaries*. As these are explained in the former *Discourse* §. 2. and in 2d *Discourse* concerning the *Guide* §. 9. &c, *viz.* in all points, that are any way beneficial, either as to the General Oeconomy or Government of the Church, or, as to the Salvation of Particulars, to be believed or practised, by her Subjects; and, the truth of which the *Scripture* or *Tradition*, at least as to the necessary Principles, from which such point is extracted, do sufficiently *evidence* unto her: Such from time to time, as they are called in Question, are stated and determined by her; whilst neither having *leisure*, nor perhaps *light* to determine all other: I mean, such as are no way necessary to be determined. Of which thing, what points are, and what are not so, the Church her self and not her Subjects, is the most proper Judge.

Ib. l. (6) *So that not making use of this talent of Infallibility gives us just reason to question, whether God continues it.* Then, from the *Church's* having *well used* this *talent* we may gather the contrary, *viz.* the Divine Providence its still *preserving* it to her.

Pag. 107. l. 9. *Which several expressions* [of Dr Field's] *amount to no more than this, that there will be always some true Christians in the world.* Contrary to this; *Dr Field* holds, that in all

all ages there is and shall be, not some true Christians only, but some *Visible Society* and *Church*, or other, consisting of a *Ministry* or Clergy openly publishing and teaching, and a *People* receiving their doctrine, that in such age, doth not err in necessaries to salvation: which tenent of his very well consists with that advice in his Preface produced by *N.O.*——*That therefore men, not having time or leisure, or strength of understanding to examine controversies in Religion of such consequence, should diligently search out, which, amongst all the Societies of the world, is that blessed Company of Holy ones, that Houshold of Faith, that Spouse of Christ, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and Ground of Truth; that so he may embrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and rest in her Judgment.* Thus he. Which cannot be spoken only of the *being always of some true Christians in the world*, that do not so err, but of a *visible society* or *Communion*; such as gives directions, and delivers her Judgment. And, (to shew him coherent to himself), This Visible Society in all ages, the excellency of it, and their happiness that are in it, he further thus describes in his 1st Book 3rd Chapter.——*Visible* (saith he there) *in respect of the profession of supernatural veracities revealed in Christ; use of Holy Sacraments; order of Ministry, and due Obedience yielded thereunto; and they discernable, that do communicate therein.* Such then he allows that Church in any age to be, that he maintains not to err in necessaries, what Church soever of that age it happens to be; as one or more it must be. And, if this be not enough to clear this; *N.O.* out of his Common-Place book (for thence our Author saith he had his quotation) can furnish him, with several other places out of Dr *Field*, that say the same thing. Such that, Ibid.——*That the constant profession of saving truth is preserved and found amongst men, and the ministery of salvation continued and known in the world; For how* (saith he) *should there be a Church gathered without a Ministery?*——And the like l. 2. c. 6.——*That the Ministery of Pastours and Teachers is absolutely necessary to the being of a Church: For how should there be a Church gathered, guided, and governed, without a Ministery?* [Therefore he will have in every age a Ministery that in necessaries doth not err.] Such that l. 4. c. 2. where he grants to *Bellarmine* expounding himself, to mean —— *Non enim Ecclesiam unum aut alterum hominem Christianum, sed multitudinem congregatam, in quâ sunt Prælati & Subditi, loquimur*, to Bellarmin, I say——*That the visible Church* [i.e. such a one as the Cardinal speaks of, consisting of Prelates & Subjects] *never faileth into any Heresy: so that* (saith he) *he is much to be blamed for idle and needless busying himself, in proving that which is most willingly*

granted.

grant. Again. l. 1. c. 10.——*Bellarmin labours in vain, in proving that there is, and always hath been a visible Church, and that not consisting of some few scattered Christians without order of Ministry, or use of Sacraments* [add what follows in Bellarmin *sed in quâ sunt Prælati & subditi*]; *for, all this we do most willingly yield unto.* Expresly excepting there against the opinion of those Protestants, that hold,——*Though, all other falling from the faith, the truth of God should remain only in some few of the laity, yet the promise of Christ concerning the perpetuity of his Church might still be verified.*

See also l. 2. c. 2. where he speaks thus——*This entire profession of the truth revealed in Christ, though it distinguish right believers from Heretics, yet it is not proper to the happy number and blessed company of Catholick Christians; because Schismaticks may, and sometimes do, hold an entire profession of the truth of God revealed in Christ. It remaineth therefore that we seek out those things that are so peculiarly found in the companies of right believing and Catholick Christians, that they may serve as Notes of difference, to distinguish them from all, both Pagans, Jews, Heretics, and Schismaticks.* The last of which *Notes* he saith there is this——*An union or connexion of men in this profession, and use of these Sacraments, under lawful Pastors and Guides, appointed, authorized, and sanctified, to direct and lead them in the happy ways of eternal salvation.* Again l. 4. c. 4. he describes this Church——*That alway retaineth a saving profession of heavenly truth such——that, by strength of Reasons, force of perswasions, timeliness of admonitions, comforts of Sacraments, and other means of saving grace——it strengtheneth and stayeth the weakness of all them, that depend upon it*: [Language not suting to a Church but such as hath in it *Pastors* and *people*: and there contends]——*That it doth not only preserve the truth as a hidden treasure, but by publick profession;——publisheth it unto the world; and stayeth the weakness of others by the knowledge of it; in which respect it is fitly compared to a Pillar, and not* [as *Bellarmine* accuseth his Church] *unto an Ark, or Chest.*

And so l. 1. Ibid. c. 5. in the words here quoted by the Dr——*Thus then we think* (saith he) *that particular men and Churches may err damnably, because notwithstanding* [this] *oth rs* [i.e. particular men and Churches] *may worship God aright; but, that the whole Church, at one time, cannot so err*; [i.e. all particular Churches that are in that time; for, besides these particulars, there is no whole.] *for that then, the Church should cease utterly for a time,——and Christ should sometimes be without a Church.* [i.e. such as consists of an united Body of Clergy or Ministers and People, as he had said before.] After which he begins thus his 6th Chapter.

——*The*

——*Thus having ſpoken of the Church's aſſured poſſeſſion of the Knowledge of truth, in the next place we are to ſpeak of her Office of Teaching, and, Witneſſing the ſame.* [The Church therefore which he underſtands to poſſeſs this truth, is ſuch alſo as *teacheth* and *witneſſeth* it.] *Thus* Dr *Field*, juſtifying *ſome* ſuch *Church* always to be not erring in Neceſſaries; but, not always the ſame, or the moſt eminent; Or thoſe that poſſeſſe the greateſt places of *Office* and *Dignity* in it: and I am ſorry, Dr *St's* miſtaken gloſſes upon him have occaſioned to me and the Reader this trouble. Meanwhile, ſince from this alledged here the miſtaking of Dr *Fields* ſenſe appears not on *N.O's* but the Dr's ſide, this his own errour might have been attended with leſs exulting and triumph and exclaiming, *O the miſchief of Common-place-books! which makes men write what they find*, &c.

But yet here the Intelligent Reader may diſcern two great flaws in this opinion of Dr *Field*. The one; that, though there is ſuch a Bleſſed Society of Clergy in every age that doth not err, yet private men cannot be ſecure, that this ſociety for a year, or a month longer, ſhall continue ſuch: ſince, though ſome one or other always *doth* not, yet any particular Church *may*, err from *Neceſſary* faith, whilſt ſome other retains it. The other, that, for knowing what particular Clergy doth not err in neceſſaries (for he ſaith, || *that thoſe who poſſeſſe great places of office and dignity in the Church of God may depart from the ſoundneſs of Chriſtian faith*) the private perſon muſt firſt know its *doctrines* to be true (which is one of the eſſential Notes he gives to diſtinguiſh it by from all other Churches in the place before-cited l.2.c.2.); from which true Doctrine in Neceſſaries, retained to day, it may alſo vary to morrow. But then how ſhall they foreknow its *Doctrines* to be *true*, who as he ſaith in his Preface *have not leiſure or capacity to examine Controverſies*; and therefore who are adviſed there for theſe doctrines *to reſt in its judgment? for theſe doctrines*, meant of points *Neceſſary*. For, thoſe only are the points, in which ſuch a *Bleſſed Society* certainly errs not. || *l.1.c.10.*

Ibid. l. 15. *And is it now imaginable after all this, that* Dr Field *ſhould make any particular Church infallible?* The precedents ſhew Dr *Field* to make ſome Viſible Church or other in whatever age *not to err in neceſſaries*, Otherwiſe, he ſaith, Chriſt *would ſometimes be without a Church*. But Dr *Field* is urged by *N.O.* only as adviſing very differently from our Author——*that ſo few having time or leiſure or ſtrength of underſtanding to examine Controverſies in Religion of ſuch conſequence, they ſhould diligently ſearch out which among ſt all the Societies of the world is that bleſſed*

Company of Holy Ones, that Houſhold of Faith, that Spouſe of Chriſt, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and ground of Truth, that ſo he may embrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and reſt in her Judgment; contrary to the Dr's 13th. and 15th Principle —*That Gods will in Neceſſaries is ſo clearly ſet down in Scripture, as mere endeavouring to underſtand the meaning of them can miſtake in theſe.* And *N.O.* contends alſo, though ſuch ſociety ſhould not be *infallible*, that yet it is the wiſeſt courſe for a private man to follow Dr *Fields* advice, and rather to acquieſce in their judgement, as more skilled &c. than in his own. As, in a ſuit of Law, we follow the directions, and reſt in the judgement of an *expert* Lawyer, though not *infallible*.

Ibid. l. (6) *A man, convinced that the Church of* England *is a ſound and good Church, ought to reſt in her judgment, ſo as not to forſake her communion for any cavils that are raiſed about particular controverſies, of which he is not a capable Judge.* *Upon being convinced that the Church of* England *is a ſound* [or orthodox] *Church to reſt in her judgment*, is only to reſt in her *judgment* where ſuch perſon firſt knows it *right* or *true*; but how then reſts he thus in *Controverſies*, wherein he is no capable Judge; and ſo doth not, foreknow her *ſoundneſs* in them? The ſame may be ſaid to that he mentions afterward concerning a man's foreknowing *the Church's integrity, honeſty, skill:* all which, ſincere and good in *one* matter, may fail in *another*. Again, where the Dr mentions reſting in this Church's judgment for peop'e *who have not either leiſure or capacity to underſtand particular controverſies*, means he, in *Neceſſaries?* Then how will his 13. and 15th *Principles* ſtand good, that from the clear delivery of ſuch points in the Scriptures the diligent cannot miſtake, nor need for their guidance therein any infallible ſociety of men? and much leſs then need they a *fallible*. But, if he makes this Society, Dr *Field* ſpeaks of, only uſeful for private men to ſubmit their judgment to in *non-neceſſaries*; it is clear Dr *Field* intends it otherwiſe; who ſaith, ſuch a *Society* in *non-neceſſaries* may err, but in *Neceſſaries* doth not: and therefore, in theſe, not the other, may ſafely be relied upon. But laſtly; if thus private men, unſeen in Controverſies, may and ought to reſt in the judgment of a particular Church *ſo qualified*, why are not ſuch much more obliged to reſt in the judgment of *N.O's* Church, contended to be *infallible* in all *Neceſſaries*, *viz.* in the Definitions of a lawful General Council? Or, in matters not ſo defined, to reſt in the judgment of the ſupremeſt Courts of the *Church Catholick* that can be had; which Church Catholick is but One, and ſubordinate in its members, ſee before §. 26? In ſtead therefore of

ſome

ſome particular Church Orthodox, let *this* be ſought out; and perpetually adhered to, when found.

Pag. 109. *l.* 7. *Do make all men impeccable if they will.* So far as God gives any man grace not to ſin, every one may be *impeccable* or may not ſin, if he will; *i.e.* if he uſes his beſt endeavours. That all are ſinners, I ſpeak as to Actual Sin, is from all failing in their *will* and *endeavours*.

Ibid. l. 14. *Who can believe the Goodneſs of God, and yet think, that he will ſuffer thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to know what is neceſſary to their ſalvation not to underſtand it?* They are not to be ſuppoſed ſincerely to endeavour to know things *Neceſſary* as they ought, who do not repair to the *Church* to learn of her Gods Truth, where this is obſcure to them in the *letter* of *Scripture*.

Ib. l. 17. *How often doth the Scripture promiſe a greater degree of knowledg to the meek, and humble, and diligent.* God teacheth the humble and diligent as well by his *Church*, as by his *Scriptures*: and one and a great duty of ſuch perſons is their ſeeking inſtructions from, and the ſubmiſſion of their judgment to, thoſe *Spiritual Guides* and *Paſtors*, whom God hath ſet over them, on purpoſe *that they may not be carried away with every wind of doctrines*, in matters that are otherwiſe to them obſcure. *Eph.* 4. 11, 13.

Pag. 110. *l.* 2. *His word ſo clear in neceſſary things, that no one who ſincerely endeavours to know them, ſhall ever miſs of ſalvation.* Here, notwithſtanding what was ſaid before by our Author p. 96, 97. and 107, 108. of uſing others *directions, reſting in the judgment of a Church, truſting the learned* ſo and ſo qualified, we are relapſed again into the 13th and 15th *Principles*; and all the weight laid on *the Clearneſs* of Scripture, as to *all* perſons, in *all* Neceſſaries: for, in ſome, none deny it.

Annotations on his §. 6. N. O's Proofs of Infallibility examined.

Pag. 112. *l.* (12) *I come to his particular Arguments which ly ſcattered up and down; but to give them the greater ſtrength I ſhall bring them nearer together.* N. O. writing no ſet Diſcourſe on a choſen or ſingle ſubject, but *Conſiderations* on 30 ſeveral *Principles* of the Dr's, and ſome *Conſequences* alſo drawn from them, his *Conſiderations* varying ſo as the *Principles*, expected the Dr ſhould in the ſame order have vindicated his 30 *Principles*,

as he laid them down, and have discovered the *Considerer's* mistakes. Instead of this, as if loth to come to such a trial, close, and perspicuous to the Reader, he finds the Dr adorning a new Discourse, as an Answer to a former Treatise that had pitched on the *same subject*, casting new *Methods*; gathering together here and there his Adversary's *Concessions*; extracting his *Principles* (and with what fidelity the *Reflections* on them have shewn), contracting and giving the summ and sense of what *N.O* thought he had writ most compendiously, and not after the manner of an Harangue, or Sermon (that needed to be epitomized); and telling his Reader here p. 112. that he *will bring nearer together N.O's arguments which ly in him scattered up and down* [that is, are there fitted to the particular *Principle* that is discoursed of] *to give them the greater strength* [a kindness Controvertists use to do to one another for their own advantage]; and so, after much pains taken in altering and transforming, and transplacing *N.O's* Conceptions, and drawing them off from the *Principles* they were fixed and applied to; and omitting them also where he thinks fit, and where they will not come within his Methods; and so leaving his *Principles* also, together with them, abandoned and unguarded (for, of the *Thirty Six* the Reader will find in all this Book a very few re-considered) he *in fine* confutes a thing of *his own* making, not *N.O's*.

Pag. 113. *l.* 14. *Is it then to be imagined, that if Christ had intended such an infallibility as the foundation of the faith and peace of his Church, he would not have delivered his minde more plainly and*
N. 1. *clearly in this matter?* Our Lord hath delivered his mind by his Apostles plainly and clearly enough concerning this matter in the *Scriptures*; and to his *Apostles*, before them. The *knowledg* of which Promise of our Lord concerning such an infallible Assistance to be for ever continued to his Church and its Guides should alwaies have descended to Posterity by *Tradition*, had there been no Scriptures: Delivered this *so plainly*, as that, upon all Controversies, concerning the dubious sense of Scriptures, thought necessary to be decided, the Church's subjects *de facto* have repaired to these Guides as believed *infallible* in all *Necessaries* upon the account, * of our Lords assisting them with his Holy Spirit promised in and before these Scriptures; & * of their being left by our Lord behind him for this end, amongst others, to keep the *Church Catholick* always in one *Faith* and one *Body*. And by these unfailing *Guides* the Church hath ever understood the *Supreme Governours* and *Pastors* of the Church assembled in a lawful *General Council*, or otherwise unanimously agreeing; Of which Councils the first was that convened

convened *Act.* 15. about ſtating the Controverſy concerning *Moſaical Ceremonies*; when, S. *Auſtin* ſaith ||——*Inter Apoſtolos de Circumciſione quæſtio, ſicut poſtea de Baptiſmo inter Epiſcopos, non Creſconius parvâ difficultate nutabat.* And theſe Fathers of the Church alſo ſo aſſembled, as acknowledging and owning the ſame their Infallibility in Neceſſaries from the ſame *Divine Promiſes*, have accordingly from time to time determined and ſtated Controverſies even in the higheſt and moſt neceſſary points concerning the *B. Trinity*, and concerning the *Humanity* of *our Lord*; and ſome of theſe Deciſions, that were thought more neceſſary to be of all men more explicitly known, they have inſerted into the common *Creed*, and have enjoined to all the members of Chriſt the belief of them, as matters of Faith; and as themſelves declaring the true and genuine Senſe of the Scriptures therein. Witneſs the points inſerted by theſe Councils in the *Athanaſian* Creed, and that with an——*Hæc eſt fides Catholica, quam niſi quiſque fideliter, firmiterque crediderit, ſalvus eſſe non poterit.* Nay, added this alſo, in the *Creed* concerning themſelves and the faithful joined with them, that the Catholick Church continues always *Apoſtolica* [preſerving the Apoſtles Rules Traditions and Doctrines], and *Una* [*indiviſa in ſe, & diviſa ab omnibus aliis*; viz. ſuch Churches or Congregations as are *Heretical*, or *Schiſmatical*] As alſo before, in the Apoſtles Creed it is ſtiled *Sancta*, i.e. ſo farr, as not to teach any Doctrine in *Faith* or *Manners* deſtructive to S. Ivation; and therefore, among *others*, not to teach *Idolatry*. And accordingly the doctrine of theſe Fathers and Councils the Church hath generally alledged as certain and infallible againſt Hereticks.

|| *Contra* *l.* 1. *c.* 3.

This Uſe and Practice of the Church from the beginning is apparent and notoriouſly known. And therefore this apparent alſo, that both the Church *Diffuſive* and theſe her *Councils* have thus underſtood our *Lords Promiſes* (the thing we here ſpeak of), as ſecuring for ever the Infallibility as to Neceſſaries of theſe *Higheſt* Eccleſiaſtical Courts; and any obſcurity in the *letter* of any of theſe *Scriptures* (were there any in this matter) this *Tradition* hath cleared to us as to the *Senſe* of them. And this *Practice of Councils and the Church-Diffuſive*, N. O. hath preſſed, to any who demand it, as a moſt incontrollable *Evidence* both of the conſtant *Tradition* of ſuch *Church-Infallibility* (as evident as that of the *Canon* of *Scriptures* is; or more than it for ſome parts of the Canon; ſince by theſe Councils alſo hath this Canon been ſettled), and of the true *ſenſe* of our Lords Promiſes in the Scriptures (or at leaſt of ſome of them), that are urged for this matter. *N.* 2.

Which

N. 3. Which *Promiſes* of our *Lord Proteſtants* alſo extend to the Church after the Apoſtles times thus far; that, in general, the *Church Diffuſive* ſhall never fail or err in Neceſſaries in any age. Nay, that *ſome* Body of *Clergy* or other ſhall never fail to teach all neceſſary truths in this Church in any age; as we have ſeen but now in Dr *Field*: || And yet further, that General Councils, *univerſally accepted*, have been and always ſhall be infallible in their Determinations concerning matters of *Neceſſary* Faith: Of which thus the Archbiſhop †——*A General Council de poſt facto after it is ended and admitted by the whole Church is then infallible.* And then for an *univerſal* acceptation I ſuppoſe none can be juſtly demanded greater or larger than that of the *four firſt* Councils was. And thus Dr *St.* † (urged by *N.O.*)——*That both the truth of Gods promiſes* [ſurely, that is in the Scriptures], *the goodneſs of God to his people, and his peculiar care of his Church ſeem highly concerned, that ſuch a Council ſhould not be guilty of any notorious errour:* [as an errour in any Neceſſary muſt be].

|| *See Note on p.107.l.9*

† *p.346.*

† *Rat. Account. p.537.*

N. 4. Laſtly, The *Scriptures* ſhewing theſe *Promiſes* (ſince the Dr ſo earneſtly calls for them) which are uſually produced by Catholick Writers, (and which are the Church's *old Armor*, as the Dr calls it † for this point; *Armor* very venerable indeed for its Antiquity, but well preſerved from the *ruſt* he complains of, by the Church's ſo frequent uſe of it againſt ſuch as the Dr,) are theſe and ſeveral others——*Matt.* 28. 19, 20.——*Jo.* 14. 16, 26.——16. 15. &c. compared with Act. 15. 28.——1. *Jo.* 5. 20. 27.——1. *Cor.* 12. 7, 8.——*Mat.* 18. 20. compared with 17, 18.——*Mat.* 16. 18, 19.——*Lu.* 23. 31.——1. *Tim.* 3. 15.——2. *Tim.* 2. 19.——*Eph.* 4. 11, 13.——2. *Pet.* 3. 16. To which Texts may be added all thoſe enjoining *Unity* of Opinion: as 1. *Cor.* 1. 10.——*Phil.* 1. 27.——2. 2, 3.——3. 16.——*Rom.* 12. 16.——17. 17.——1. *Cor.* 14. 32, 33. Which *Unity* of *Opinion* I ask how it can be had, unleſs there be in the Church ſome Perſons, whoſe *Judgment*, *Doctrine*, *Faith*, *Spirit*, all the reſt are to follow and conform to? Which Scriptures forementioned you may ſee alſo briefly vindicated from ſuch *gloſſes* as *Proteſtants*, and *particularly Dr St.* in his *Rat. Account*, † do put upon them, in the 1. *Diſc.* concerning the *Guide in Controverſies* §. 7 8. *&c.* But, whatever may be urged (touching the ſenſe of theſe Scriptures) *pro* or *con* by particular Authors, yet both the foreſaid *practice* of *General Councils* built upon ſuch a traditive ſenſe of thoſe Texts, as Catholicks contend for, and the *Church's* general *approving* and acceptation of ſuch practice, and ſubmiſſion to it, is a ſufficient preſcription of *Tradition* to warrant and ſecure ſuch a ſenſe againſt all contradiction. Therefore *N.* 6.

† *See p.127.*

† *p.256. &c.*

p.57

p. 57. tells the Dr, that Catholicks are not neceſſitated, in arguing againſt Proteſtants, who grant the Scriptures to be Gods word, to uſe any other Teſtimony than that of theſe *Scriptures* for a ſufficiently clear proof of *Church-infallibility*. For that he may ſafely call this a *clear* proof, even according to the Dr's *common reaſon of Mankind*, which by the *moſt* of the Chriſtian world is taken to be ſo, notwithſtanding that a Party, engaged by their Reformation in an apparent contrary intereſt, do contradict it. [And indeed, if we look after the fact it ſelf and the fulfilling of ſuch a ſenſe of them as applied to S. *Peters* Succeſſor, and to the *Roman* & other Churches united to it, the Dr I think grants, that theſe Churches or their Prelats aſſembled in their moſt General Councils, from the Apoſtles days to the preſent *de facto* never have erred in points *Neceſſary* to the *Being* of a *Church*. Of which ſee what is ſaid in the former Diſcourſe §. 53. and the places cited out of him in Note on p. 75. *l.* 5. *N.* 8. And he ſeems neceſſitated thereto for the reaſon given before *Ibid. N.* 7. Now, if this Being of a true Church or a member of the Catholick be ſtated as it ought, or as Dr *Field* l. 2. c. 2. and l. 4. c. 2. hath ſtated it, it muſt be affirmed that theſe Churches, being allowed members of the Catholick, have hitherto never fallen into any Hereſy.]

This *Plea* of *N.O.* I deſire may be applied by the Reader to the Dr's Diſcourſe, ſo often as he queſtions ſuch a *ſenſe* of theſe Scriptures and Promiſes of our Lord, or ſuch a *Tradition*, and that the Reader would well examine, what ſatisfaction he finds from the Anſwers the Dr hath here returned to it. Which former *practice* of *Church* and *Councils*, if once allowed, *Chillingworth* ‖ ‖ ſaw preſſed ſo far for *Church-Infallibility*, and a proportionable *Obedience* to it, that, as *N.O.* hath obſerved in his Preface, he plainly declares—*That what warrant the Fathers of the Church in after times to the Apoſtles, had to oblige others to receive their Declarations under pain of damnation* [which they did] *he knew not: and that he that can ſhew either that the Church of all ages was to have this authority, or that it continued in the Church for ſome ages and then expired* [this, becauſe ſome Proteſtants, amongſt whom this Dr, would willingly ſubmit to four or five of the firſt Councils, for which yet *Chillingworth* could ſee no juſt reaſon why ſuch Poſt-Apoſtolick Authority for *ſome* time admitted ſhould *not be ſo* always], *he that can ſhew either of theſe things* (ſaith he) *let him*; *for my part I cannot*. [He goes on] *Yet I willingly confeſs the Judgment of a Council, though not infallible, yet ſo far directive and obliging, that, without apparent reaſon to the contrary, it may be ſin to reject it, at leaſt not to afford it an outward ſubmiſſion.*

N. 5.

p. 200.

miſſion for publick peace ſake. Where the words *though not infallible* ſhew that he held, the practice of former Councils, diſallowed by him, clearly inferred *Infallibility*; the thing *N.O.* urgeth.

Meanwhile, whatever ſatisfaction he may find for either opinion here debated, the Reader may obſerve; that, both from *Scripture* and *Tradition*, *N.O.* contends for the Infallibility of General Councils in *Neceſſaries*, and accordingly requires Submiſſion of Judgment to their Definitions; *the Dr* oppoſeth it: and the Reader hath alſo juſt cauſe to think there is ſome reaſon and intereſt in the two Religions, of *N.O.* and of Dr *St.* and Mr *Chillingworth*, for this *defence* made by the one, and *Oppoſition* by the other: and laſtly any plebeian may diſcern, what are the *two* neceſſary effects, of the ſubmiſſion of private mens judgments to General Councils, as ſuch; or withdrawing it from them, as not ſuch: viz. *Unity*, and *Diviſion*.

Pag. 113. *l.* 19. *How eaſily might all the contentions of the Chriſtian world have been prevented, if Chriſt had ſaid*, &c. We muſt not preſcribe to God, but humbly leave to him the way, how he ſhall be pleaſed to manifeſt his Will to us, (ſure to be, one way or other ſufficiently made known), by the *clearneſs* of his 1Cor.11.19 *Scriptures*, or *expoſitions* of his *Church*. For alſo——*Oportet eſſe hereſes, ut qui probati ſunt, manifeſti fiant.* Would not the Creed of *Pius* 4. or the 39. Articles of the Church of *England*, delivered by our Lord or his Apoſtles have prevented many Controverſies now extant? See in the former Diſcourſe §. 1.

Pag. 115. *l.* 5 *If this point* [viz. of an infallible Judge] *be not clearly proved, we are never the nearer an end of controverſies* &c. Yes. If ſuch an *unappealable* Judge be proved, as none may oppoſe, or reform againſt.

Ib. l. 18. *Let them if they can produce one clear Text* &c. I || *Note on p.* 113. *l.* 14. *numb.* 4. referr to the Texts forementioned ||, interpreted by the common practice of Councils, and of the Church in all ages, grounded upon the traditive underſtanding them in ſuch a ſenſe.

Annotations on his §. 7. The Arguments from Scripture for Infallibility.

Pag. 116. *l.* 1. *When I came thus prepared to find what the Conſiderator would produce in a matter of ſuch conſequence, I ſoon diſcerned, how little mind he had* &c. *N.O.* is not obliged to ſay every thing in every place. This Author will needs transform *N.O.'s*

N.O's brief *Considerations* on his Principles into a set *Discourse* of *Infallibility*, and then shew its Defectiveness, as such. One would think, if he had not the reputation of a learned man, done on purpose to divert his Reader from any other matters that are debated there by *N.O*, and to release himself from prosecuting the necessary vindication of his own *Principles* from the several deficiencies charged on them, in the *Considerations*.

Ib. l. 10. *But however, this* [Deut 17. 10.] *is thought so considerable as to be twice produced.* Upon our Authors mentioning the *clearness* of Gods Law given to *Moses*, *N.O.* mentioned these *Judges* also appointed to *expound* it: and the one is twice repeated, because the other twice urged.

Ib. l. 13. *It is so unlucky, as it proves the Judges in Westminster Hall to be infallible.* Of this Comparison of the *Sanhedrim* to the Judges in *Westminster Hall*, and how the great causes between *Church* and *Church* are fit to be handled *there*, ‖ let our Author, if he can, give a just account. These *Judges* were appointed by God to decide the true *Sense* of the Law not of *Princes*, but of *God*, given to *Moses*; and all persons obliged to acquiesce in the sense they gave of it; and to *do* and *forbear* to practise as they (fallible, or infallible) stated such matter to be commanded or prohibited by it; and that upon pain of death. This Obedience let *Protestants* yield to lawful *General Councils*; more is not desired.

‖ *See his Epist. Dedicatory.*

Ib. l. (11) *Doth this imply infallibility? No, that he dares not stand to, but absolute obedience.* I think the Dr grants here, the people yielded *absolute* obedience to these *Judges*: *i.e.*, I suppose, *assent* to their sentence, deciding to them what was the true sense of Gods Law; which is all *N.O.* presseth (and indeed, unless they first yielding this, the people could not lawfully *act* whatever these Judges commanded). Do the people then the same to the Judges in *Westminster*? i.e. hold themselves obliged to do whatever these tell them is lawful, or commanded, I mean by Gods law? Let him review here what he hath said in his *Rational Account*, if he pleaseth, p. 239. to the contrary; allowing an obligation to *submission* or *acquiescence*, but not an obligation in *conscience*: and, if he please too, that which Mr *Chillingworth* ‖ hath observed of the difference between a *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical* Judge: *Viz. that in civil controversies we are obliged only to external passive obedience, and not to an internal and active. We are bound to obey the sentence of the Judge, or not to resist it; but not always to believe it just. But in matters of Religion such a Judge is required, whom we should be obliged to believe to have judged right. So that in*

‖ *c.* 2. §. 17.

civil controversies every honest understanding man is fit to be a Judge; but in Religion none but he that is infallible [at least in all *necessary* matters]. Thus he.

Ib. l. (9). *Which absolute obedience we are ready to yield, when we see the like absolute command for Ecclesiastical Judges of controversies of Religion, as there was among the Jews for their Supreme Judges in matters of law.* What thinks he of our Lords *Dic Ecclesiæ*——and——*Si Ecclesiam non audierit, sit tibi sicut Ethnicus* &c, in the sense wherein *Church-Tradition* hath understood this Text as applied to the highest *Courts* of the *Church*, and to their cutting off by a spiritual death the disobedient, whether *contradicters*, or *dissenters*? Is there more injustice and tyranny in this, than inflicting a corporal death on the dissenters or contradicters, under *Moses* his *law*? This Discourse of the Dr, as also what he hath said of the same matter, *Rat. Account.* p. 239. I had occasion to examine in the former Discourse, §. 22. &c, to which I referr the Reader for what is here omitted.

Pag. 117. *l.* 7. *Such a pretence, implying an infallible assistance of the Spirit of God, there were but two ways of proving it, either* 1. *By such Miracles as the Apostles wrought to attest their Infallibility; or* 2. *By those Scriptures, from whence this Infallibility is derived.* What thinks he of a third way of proving it, *viz.* By *Tradition*? But then, If the Church-Guides give this evidence of their being infallibly assisted by the Holy Ghost in necessaries, namely the clear Testimony of the Scriptures, I ask, is not this sufficient for the world to credit them to be so, without their doing Miracles? Doth not this Author, of the two ways to prove it named just before, allow either of them sufficient? Now see this latter proved before in Note on p. 113. l. 17. and so I hope we may peaceably take leave of *Miracles*.

Pag. 118. *l.* 2. *When I speak of infallibility in fundamentals, I there declare that I mean no more by it, than that there shall be always a number of true Christians in the world.* Now, whence learns he this, that true Christians shall never faile? I suppose, whence other Protestants do: *viz.* from the Promise of our Lord in Scripture, that *the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against his* Church. See Archbishop *Laud* p. 140. ——*That the whole Church* (saith he) *cannot err in doctrines absolutely fundamental seems to me to be clear by the promise of Christ* Mat. 16. *That the gates of hell* &c. [And it is as clear, that the Arch-bishop meant it not only of a number of *true Christians*, as our Author doth here; but, of true *Pastors* also and *Doctors* of the Church.] If this *Promise* then be enough for believing of this, the non-failing of Christians that shall

ſhall believe all neceſſary truth without *Miracles*; will it not, ſuppoſing ſuch a promiſe made to them, be as ſufficient for believing the other, the indefectibility of the Church-Guides as to teaching all neceſſary faith, without their *doing Miracles?*

Ib. l. 16. *But, in caſe any perſons challenge an infallibility to themſelves antecedently to the belief of Scriptures* &c, *ſuch perſons are equally bound to prove their infallibility by Miracles as the Apoſtles were.* What if they challenge this Infallibility likewiſe from the Scriptures; as moſt certainly they do? This latter challenge of theirs, ſurely, will ſuperſede *Miracles*. But let us ſuppoſe no ſuch challenge. What thinks he, if they produce the evidence of *Tradition* for their Infallibility antecedently to *Scripture*, as alſo they do? Is not this (we here ſuppoſe there is ſuch a Tradition, which is proved before ||) a ſufficiently clear and ſelf-evident proof of it? If not of their *Infallibility*; how then is the ſame *Tradition*, without *Miracles*, a ſufficient proof to Proteſtants of the *Canon* or *Infallibility* of *Scriptures*? Suppoſe the ſame promiſes made & no Scriptures written, would not the Catholick Church have been, what it is? and, muſt it then have perpetually-ſhewn Miracles, or no Infallibility as to Neceſſaries have been believed in it?

|| *Note on p.* 113 *l.* 14.

Ib. l. (7) *The Sum of which is* &c. In the Dr's ſuming of *N.O's* Anſwers ſtill ſomthing is loſt: as here, the *Reaſon* is omitted, why no ſuch need of Miracles to be done by the Church-Governours, delivering only from age to age that Doctrine, which by the firſt Teachers was ſufficiently confirmed by *Miracles*: *viz.* this, the *Evidence of Tradition*, which, received from the Apoſtles and from their Anceſtors, they unanimouſly convey unto Poſterity. Yet ſuch Miracles were neceſſary then to more perſons than thoſe *Apoſtles* who made the very *firſt* Sermons concerning the Goſpel; becauſe the bare Tradition of a few at the firſt was not ſo evidently credible, as that which by many Sermons made, and Miracles done, in many places, afterward became *Univerſal*.

Pag. 119. *l.* 12. *The neceſſity of Miracles was to give a ſufficient motive to believe to all thoſe to whom the Goſpel was propoſed.* Muſt all then, in the Apoſtles times, who received the faith ſee their Miracles? Or, if their *Miracles*, only related to them by a creditable *Tradition*, would ſerve the turn, why not the ſame Miracles related, now?

Pag. 120. *l.* 1. *Thoſe perſons ought to confirm that authority by Miracles, as the Apoſtles did.* And again *l.* 20. See Note on p. 118. l. 11.

N. 1. *Ibid. l.* (11.) *Yet he is very loth to let go the Miracles of their Church done in latter times as well as formerly.* *N.O.* ‖ *is loth to let go the Miracles of their Church:* i.e. of the Catholick Church, *East* or *West*, (for both have been noted for Miracles).

‖ *See Consid. p.* 29.

In latter times: i.e. from the Apoſtles daies to the preſent: there being the ſame evidences, in all ages, of the facts (I ſay not, of all the facts that are related, but of many of them, which is ſufficient); and the ſame Reaſons, where and when the World is already Chriſtian, in all times for the doing of them. *N.O. loth to let them go*; not as to this, his affirming a Neceſſity of them now in the Church for the believing of its *Infallibility*, or any other part of the Chriſtian *Doctrine*; or alſo, for the *Converſion* of the yet Infidel and Heathen Nations after ſuch a plenitude of Tradition appearing in the greateſt part of the world already ſubdued by the Goſpel: Of which *non-neceſſity N.O.* ſaith ‖——*That Miracles, having been wrought by the Apoſtles in confirmation of that Doctrine, which their Succeſſors deliver from them, are not now alike neceſſary to, or reaſonably demanded of, theſe their Succeſſors.*

¶ *Princ. Conſid. p.* 29.

N. 2. But he is *very loth*, notwithſtanding this, *to part with true Miracles* ſtill wrought in the Church ſince the Apoſtles times: and theſe too of the very ſame kinds, as were ſome of thoſe at leaſt, that were done by the Apoſtles, and our Lord himſelf: *viz.* by which *Devils* have been caſt out, the *blinde* received their ſight, *lame* have walked, *lepers*, been cleanſed, *deaf* heard, *Dead* been raiſed up: And this for many good ends, though the *Converſion* of *Infidels* or *Atheiſts*, (that in all times, more or fewer, ly hidden within the Church of God) be not numbred amongſt them: As, for the *Confirmation* of the Catholick *Faith* againſt Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; Or, for atteſtation of the *Sanctity* of thoſe who work ſuch Miracles, for others imitation of their mortifications and vertues: or for the more viſible teſtimony of *Gods Preſence* in the Church, and the encouragement of *Prayer* to him, and *Faith* in him, and expecting help from him in all manner of occurrences and neceſſities, and the like. And, for a proof of the *Continuance* of ſuch *Miracles* ſtill in the Church, even when and where *Chriſtianity* already was firmly rooted and eſtabliſhed, *N.O.* made choice, for an Inſtance, of that *Relation* in S. *Auſtin De Civ. Dei lib.* 22. *cap.* 8. of the very many true Miracles in theſe kinds he himſelf had known and ſeen in his own days and Dioceſs. Of which he there ſaith——*Si miracula ſanitatum, ut alia taceam, ea tantummodo velim ſcribere, quæ per hunc Martyrem id eſt, glorioſiſſimum Stephanum, facta ſunt in Colonia Calamenſi & in noſtra, plurimi conficiendi ſunt libri.* And——*Nondum*

dum eſt biennium, ex quo apud Hipponem Regium cœpit eſſe iſta memoria, & multis, quod nobis certiſſimum eſt, non datis libellis, de ijs quæ mirabiliter facta ſunt, illi ipſi qui dati ſunt ad ſeptuaginta fermè numerum pervenerant, quando iſta conſcripſi; Calamæ verò, ubi & ipſa memoria prius eſſe cœpit & crebrius dantur, incredibili multitudine ſuperant. Uzali etiam, quæ Colonia Uticæ vicina eſt, multa præclara per eundem Martyrem facta cognovimus. Many of which *Miracles* were of the ſame kinds as thoſe done by *our Lord* and his *Apoſtles*; many *Blind* reſtored to ſight beſides him at *Millain*; the *Infirm* in all ſorts of inveterate and irrecoverable diſeaſes miraculouſly cured; *evil Spirits* ejected both out of *Perſons*, and *Houſes*; and many *Dead* alſo reſtored to life; the Father mentions of theſe laſt ſome *ſix*, or *ſeven*. Which *Miracles* he hath collected in that Chapter, being firſt clearly evidenced to him; and of which he cauſed to be drawn up publick Bills or Records and Memorials to be recited to the people, imitated in this by the Church-Governors in latter times.—*Id namq; fieri voluimus* (ſaith he‖) *cùm videremus antiquis ſimilia divinarum ſigna virtutum etiam noſtris temporibus frequentari.* [Where our Author ‖ finds *ſigna* or σημεῖα, as well as δυνάμεις; and this long after *Julian* was deſtroyed; and where there were (ſome *Heretick*s perhaps, but) no *Pagans* to behold, or be converted by, them. Which *Frequency* of ſo great *Miracles*, within the compaſs of ſo ſmall a time, it ſeemed convenient to the *Dr* in that *Diſcourſe* ‖ to paſs over in ſilence, and to diſcover to his Reader no more than *the cure of one blind man at* Millan, *a Cancer*, *a Fiſtula*, and *two ſhaking perſons in Affrica*: and then to conclude that *S.* Auſtin *confeſſeth, they were neither for number nor quality to be compared with Chriſt's, and his Apoſtles.*]

‖ *Ibid.*

‖ *See Dr St. 2. Diſc. c. 3. of Miracles, p. 578.*

‖ *p. 585.*

N.O had reaſon, then, to be loth to part with *Miracles* in the *Church* for the *times* that followed the *Apoſtles*: and to be loth to part with them as well for the *latter* as the *former* times, if theſe *Miracles* equally evidenced in both: and eſpecially alſo when there is no reaſon pretendable, after the Chriſtian Religion formerly planted in ſuch Churches, for theſe done in the *former*, that doth not as well ſute to the *latter*, ages.

N. 3. Neither ought the proving of ſeveral *Miracles*, whether Ancient, or Modern, to have been *feigned* (for, what gains credit is apt to be ſo), or alſo *vain* and *ridiculous*, (for; ſeveral, when feigned by the vulgar, are ſo), which alſo are both granted, and diſcovered, to be ſo by Catholicks, to ſway any ſo much, as from thence to draw a Concluſion, either that *none* at all of latter times, related in *Saint's Lives*, or other *Church-Hiſtory*, are *true* and ſufficiently teſtified; or that, being true, they do not ſufficiently ſerve

serve the turn, without the rest that are falsified, for all the *Ends* forenamed. And thus only, it seems, could this * *Author* have written to the purpose in that long *discourse* of his, if he had shewed, *none* of the Miracles pretended in the Roman Church to have been sufficiently attested, or equally, to those of *Antiquity*, which he allows: or, *none* to have been of the same kind with our Lord's and his Apostles: and so not these where frequently done, to have manifestly, testified (as theirs did) the truth of the *Religion* that is in such a society professed: And, again, * if he had shewed the many *Catholick Authors* he cites, to have complained not of some, but a *general* falsification of the Miracles occurring in the *Records* of latter times: I say, thus this Author had written something to the purpose. But here the mischief is, that all these *Catholick Authors* quoted by him do maintain a continuance of true Miracles, to *some degree*, and as to *some persons*, still in the Church: and as they inveigh against the *fraud* and *forgery* of some, so stand up as much for the *truth* and *certainty* of others; and, out of their affection to the *credit* of the *one*, do so much endeavour to *sever* from them, and crush, and suppress, the *other*.

* *Enquiry into Rom. Miracles.*

Ib. l. (4.) *All the Miracles pretended among them signify nothing to our present purpose; unless these miracles give evidence of the authority, and infallibility, of those, by whom they were done.*

Here I say; First, that there is no necessity of evidencing now the *Church's Authority*, or *Infallibility* by *Miracles*. 2ly, That *true Miracles*, I mean, such, as our *Lord* and his *Apostles* did, *the giving sight to the blind, raising the dead*, &c, especially if there be considered a like frequency and proof or evidence of them, are done only in the Catholick Church (where also the *Frequency* of *them* produceth that firm belief, by the satisfaction and conviction of many persons by some or other of these miracles, that are either seen by them, or by such as were present are confirmed to them, which belief some *single Facts* in other false *Religions*, that are rarely pretended to be done, and in some remote times, and so are destitute of any such evidence of attestation, or discovery of their truth, cannot effect). And that such Miracles as these are not done (for any *end* whatever) elsewhere by *Heathens*, or by *Heretick*s. For, if such Miracles, no way distinguishable or diversified from those of our Lord or his *Apostles*, were seen to be really done by false Religions as *well* and as *usually* as in the *Church Catholick*, the *End*, wherefore done, would be a thing of the greatest *uncertainty*; and most easily mistaken, or misrelated: and, after the *Clear evidence* of such Miracles done there, this *end* would be represented by every *Religion* to their own advantage, as they pleased; and thus *all* Religions

ligions would come to have an undiſcernably equal Plea of their *Confirmation* by *Miracles*. Therefore in the Scripture we finde not the *End*, why the Miracle was done, chiefly inſiſted on or proved to the people, (Yet the clearing of which *End*, in ſuch caſe of *all Religions* doing the ſame *True* Miracles, were the thing the moſt neceſſary) but the *Fact*; and from it preſently gathered the Catholickneſs, and the Divine approbation, of the *Perſon*. See *John*. 9. 16, 17, 30, 31, 33. *Such* and *ſo well atteſted* Miracles therefore as our *Lord* and his *Apoſtles* did I gather never have been, never ſhall be, done by any perſons in a *falſe Religion*, or that are no members of the *Catholick* Church. 3. And then, this granted, I may hence faſely conclude alſo, that ſuch *Miracles* do always evidence the Church wherein they are done to be the *Catholick*, and ſo that Church, to which our Lords Promiſes of *Infallibility*, as to all *Neceſſaries*, do belong. Add to this; that, if any *True Miracles* can be ſhewn in the *Roman* Church, the Dr's words following ſeem to make good its *Infallibility*:——*For* (ſaith he ||) *they would do well to ſhew, where, ever in Scripture God did beſtow a gift of Miracles upon any, but for this end,* [i.e. *to give evidence of the Authority and Infallibility of thoſe by whom they were done*]; *and what reaſon there is, that God ſhould alter the method and courſe of his Providence, in a matter of ſo great concernment to the Faith of Mankind.* So he. If then God never beſtows a gift of Miracles for any other end, ſave t' is; then, if *true Miracles* ſuch as our *Lord's* be proved, *Infallibility* alſo is proved, to be in the *Roman* Catholick Church. || p. 121. l. 1.

But, to reflect on theſe words of his,——[*They would do well to ſhew*, &c.], a litle further. If our Author means here, by the *Miracle's* ſhewing the *infallibility* of the Worker, ſuch an Infallibility as the *Apoſtles* had in delivering nothing by word or writing but *Gods word* and the Dictates of the *Holy Ghoſt*, I can ſhew him in Scripture many, that were the Inſtruments of working miracles and had not *this*; as thoſe *Corinthians* and others in the Apoſtles times, 1 *Cor*. 12. 10, 28, 30. God beſtowing this Gift on ſeveral others there, beſides the Apoſtles, who had not an *Apoſtolical* Infallibility. Of all which holy perſons, whom God honours thus with Miracles, though it may be ſaid, that, what ſuch deliver for *Gods Faith*, certainly *is* ſo, (who otherwiſe would never be aſſiſted with *Miracles*, [which are alwaies a ſcale of *truth*] if delivering *falſities* as Divine truths); Yet it cannot be ſaid of *them* as of the *Apoſtles*; that whatever they deliver is Gods Truth, whilſt, in their delivering it, they do not pretend it ſo; as the Apoſtles did ſo pretend it; and therefore, upon doing *Miracles*, were to be believed in ſuch their *pretenſion*. But, if thoſe whom God honours with

with miracles are to be believed in what they ſay, then cannot their Miracles be urged for an infallibility in all they ſhall teach or hold, who do themſelves *ſay* and *profeſſe* the contrary. Their Miracles confirm and make good what they pretend to, but not more. I ſay then, if the Dr means here: That whoever have the gift of doing Miracles have likewiſe ſuch an infallibility in all they ſay, as was in the Apoſtles, it holds not true. For, the *Corinthians* alſo had ſuch a Gift who were not in ſuch a manner infallible. But, if He means here, that none have had this Gift or done any ſuch *evident* and frequent *Miracles*, but ſuch only as have taught or held the *infallible Catholick faith* as to all the *neceſſary* points thereof; (the faith, I ſay, which being entirely delivered by the Apoſtles there is no further need of infallibility like to that of theirs, for conveying the ſame as it was received from them to poſterity), I accord with him; and contend, that none to this day have had ſuch *Gift*, ſave ſuch *Orthodox* perſons: No *Pagans*, no *Hereticks*: true Miracles ſuch as our Lord and his Apoſtles did being diſtinctive ſignes that accompany and follow only true Believers according to our Lord's promiſe *Mar.* 16. 17. for whatever *Ends* theſe Miracles happen to be beſtowed; as they may be for many, beſides the *Confirmation* of the *Catholick Faith*. Therefore, where a Frequency of true Miracles is ſeen in any Communion, we may ſafely follow the profeſſion of its Faith: God having provided, that his *Catholick Church* and *true Miracles* ſhall never be parted; *i.e.* that, where the latter are, there is the former. By *True Miracles* I mean ſuch (though it needs not to be, all ſuch) as our Lord and his Apoſtles did; and ſo clearly teſtified by *Eye-Witneſſes*, as their's were or might be. And I exclude here all ſuch effects, though *miraculous* to *us*, as *evil Spirits*, God permitting, have a power to effect by the inſtrumency and application of ſome natural Agents, though this tranſcending any humane Art or Capacity. For, ſuch miracles, I willingly grant both *Magicians* and alſo *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks* may operate by the aſſiſtance of theſe Angelical powers therein; either Voluntary, or alſo conſtrained as to the inferiour ſort of theſe Spirits compelled thereto by their Superiours. But the former, ſuch as our Lord and his Apoſtles wrought, ſurpaſſing all the power of *Nature* do alſo that of *Evil Spirits*, or of any their *Inſtruments*, & are by Chriſtians eaſily diſtinguiſhable from theſe other.

Pag. 121. *l.* 7. *Such Miracles as were wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles we defy all other Religions in the world to produce any like them, to confirm their Doctrine.* i.e. As one may underſtand him; Neither *Heathens*, neither *Heretical* Churches can ever do any ſuch Miracles as were wrought by our *Lord* and his *Apoſtles*, viz.

viz. give *ſight* to the *blind*, cure the *ſick*, raiſe again the *dead*, &c. From which it follows, that whatever Church doth ſuch Miracles muſt be the Catholick; & from this, that ſuch Miracles whereever they are found in any age, do ſhew the Church wherein they are done to be Infallible in Neceſſaries; for ſo the *Catholick Church* is. But, if here he puts in the laſt words [*to confirm their doctrine*] as limiting the former, and carrying ſuch a ſenſe, that other Religions, beſide the Catholick, may alſo do all ſuch Miracles as our Lord and his Apoſtles did for ſome other *ends*; but not for this, viz. *to confirm their doctrine*, or *Religion*, I think he will have an hard task of it, either * to ſhew, that the *Hiſtorians*, that have related ſuch miracles have not alſo applied them to the juſtifying of the *Doctrine* and *Religion* that ſuch Heathen or Heretical Miracle-workers profeſſed, and of the *Honour* of thoſe *Gods*, they ſerved [ſuppoſe thoſe *Miracles* of *Pythagoras* or *Æſculapius*, or *Apollonius Thyaneus*, or of the *Arian* or *Donatiſt*-Biſhops; who urged them againſt S. *Auſtin* for a juſtification of their *ſect* and orthodoxneſs of their doctrine]: Or, on the other ſide, * to ſhew; that thoſe, who have related our Lord's and his Apoſtle's Miracles, have, to give theſe their juſt force and value, expreſſed alwaies that they were done to this *end* the Dr mentions here; and not to ſome other ends, from which conſequently nothing could be concluded concerning the *truth* of their *doctrine*: Of which *end* of them therefore it concerned the world chiefly to be informed; not of the *fact*: Or * to ſhew, that our *Lord* or his Apoſtles alwaies cleared this to be their end, to their Auditors and ſpectatours; which was in the firſt place neceſſary to be done. But the people we ſee, without examining this, argued the men to be from God from their beholding the Miracles done: And the Phariſees, not dreaming of the neceſſity of ſuch a circumſtance, never offered to elude any of our Lords Miracles (as for example that done upon the blind man. *Jo.* 9.) alledging them to be done not in confirmation of his doctrine, but upon ſome other by-account, and ſo, as they might poſſibly be done alſo in a *falſe Religion*; and ſo his *Doctrine* to be rendred no way more *creditable* thereby.

Ib. l. 10 *But ſuch as the Church of Rome pretends, ſcarce any Religion in the world but hath pretended to the ſame.* 1ſt Here, that the ſame Miracles are pretended by *other* Religions, that are by the *Roman* Church, will ſignify nothing, if they have not as good ground for, or proof of, what they pretend: Or, if thoſe, which are not only pretended, but *really* done in the Roman, be only *pretended* in the other. 2ly. The *Roman Church* pretends many ſuch, as the whole Catholick Church (if ſuch a Church

there was in being) did in *many ages* before *Luther*, and even all along from the *Primitive* times; as sufficiently appears in *Ecclesiastical History*. 3ly. These Miracles pretended both by the *present Roman* and by the *Ancient Catholick* Church were of the very same kind as those wrought by *Christ* and his *Apostles*; *i. e.* giving *sight* to the *blinde*, healing the *sick*, raising the *dead*, casting out *devils*; *Fiunt ergò nunc* (saith S. *Augustine*) *multa miracula, eodem Deo faciente per quos vult, & quemadmodum vult; qui & illa, quæ legimus* [in the Scriptures] *fecit*||; and which Miracles are such, as this Authour here seems to say can never be done by any other *Religions* than the true. 4ly, That *such Miracles* were not only pretended, but *really* done in the Church Catholick in the *ancienter* times, as in S. *Austin's*, this Authour I suppose will not deny, & also hath granted; See in his 2. *Disc.* c. 3. p. 378. 380. and then there seems no reason why he should deny the like in the Church of *latter* ages, or in the present, If there appear first, as no absolute *necessity* of these Miracles in *latter* times, so neither in S. *Austin's*. 2ly, If there be the same ends and benefit of them still in these, as in his; *viz.* the greater manifestation of Gods *Presence* and *Providence* in his Church; the *Honour* he is pleased to do to his more extraordinary faithful Servants; the *rewards* of a strong and unwavering *Faith* of obtaining what is asked for his better service, and greater glory; and lastly, that end mentioned by S. *Austin*, our greater *edification* in the *true* faith. See *De Cura pro Mort.* c. 16. where he saith, that Miracles are done —*Per Martyrum Memorias, quoniam hoc novit expedire nobis ad ædificandam fidem Christi, pro cujus illi confessione sunt passi*; 3ly. Where the Histories of *latter* times produce as evident and irrefragable testimonies of the truth of *several* of these Miracles done in them (which is sufficient,) as those in S. *Austin's* days had.

||*De Civit. Dei, l.* 22. *c.* 8.

Ib. l. (7) *Who all pretend to Miracles as well as the Church of Rome.* Pretend as well; but, I hope, not so *truly*; nor 2ly so *much*: the pretences of Heathens or Hereticks to Miracles being no way comparable, for *number*, or *greatness*, to those pretended in the Church *Catholick*, or *Roman*. No more, than *Simon Magus* his are to those of the Apostles: and those few also, that are said to be done by the *Heathens* after the Apostles days, seem feigned, in emulation of the great reputation of *those* of *Christians*. But Pretences on any side signify nothing. The Catholick and the Roman Church require *belief* of *Miracles* not upon pretence, but a *Rational Evidence*.

Pag. 122. *l.* 15. *But, he saith, a Christians faith may begin either at the infallible authority of Scripture, or of the Church.* i. e. That

That the firſt Article that a Chriſtian believes, or that, in his *learning* the *Faith*, is by his Parents or other inſtructers firſt made known to him, may be this, *that the Scriptures are Gods word and infallible*; or may be this, *that the Church is Infallible*: I add, or perhaps neither of theſe, but ſome other: As that God hath a Son; and that he became Incarnate for his ſake, and the like. Any of which Articles ſuch Chriſtian may ſavingly and with a Divine faith believe, without being made infallibly certain thereof from ſome other formerly-known Divine Revelation, on which this Article may be grounded. As, for example, ſuch perſon may, with a *divine* and *ſaving* faith, believe the *Scriptures* to be *Gods word*, before he believe the *Church* to be *infallible* that hath defined the *Canon* of Scripture: Or, believe the *Church* to be *infallible*, before he knows thoſe *Scriptures* to be *Gods Word*, by which *Church-Infallibility* is proved.

Ib. l. 18. *It ſeems then, there may be ſufficient ground for a Chriſtian faith, as to the Scriptures, without believing any thing of the Church's Infallibility; and for this we have reaſon to thank him, whatever they of his own Church think of it.* Yes; there may ſo. A Chriſtian, not as yet believing, the *Infallibility* of the *Church* as divinely aſſiſted, may both believe, and have a ſufficient ground of believing the *Infallibility* of *Scripture*, viz. the fore-mentioned *Tradition*. And, as Catholick Writers ordinarily ſtate it, to whom the Dr owes his thanks, as well as to *N.O.* It is not neceſſary, that the firſt thing every Catholick believes, or is ſufficiently certain of, be Church-Infallibility. See the Catholick Authors cited in 3d *Diſc.* of the *Guide*, §. 129. n. 4. &c.

Ib. l. (3). *Nay he goes yet further, and ſaith, That the Infallibility of Scriptures, as well as the Church, may be proved from its own teſtimony.* And adds this Reaſon. *For* (ſaith he ‖) *whoever is proved* [*i. e. by ſome other medium*] *or granted once infallible in what he ſaith, the conſequence is clear* (*without any Circle or* Petitio principii, *or identical arguing*) *that whatever he doth witneſs of himſelf is true.* And can the Doctor diſprove this? ‖ *Princ. Conſid. p.* 37

Pag. 123. *l.* 3. *Not ſhewing at all, how the infallibility of the Church can be proved from Scripture.* And the reaſon of this was, to ſhew that Catholicks have no neceſſity, for proving *Church-Infallibility*, to return to the teſtimony of the *Scriptures* for it; as the Dr and ſome other Proteſtants ſay, they muſt.

Annotations on his 8. §. The Argument from Tradition for Infallibility.

Pag. l. 11. *The method of his diſcourſe is this*, &c. Whoever learns the method of ones diſcourſe from an Adverſary is ſeldom rightly informed: who will not be deceived muſt conſult the *Author*. As for example here, in the Dr's giving an account of *N.O's* Method concerning Tradition, he hath fairly left out that which *N.O.* moſt preſſed, *viz.* theſe Governours of the Church in their *General Councils* inſerting from time to time, as they thought fit, their *Deciſions* in the Church's *Creeds*; which ſhews what opinion both General Councils and the whole Church have had of the *Infallibility* of their *Deciſions*, and which by *N.O.* was named in the firſt place, and preceded their *Anathematizing* of *Diſſenters*.

Pag. 124. *l.* 8. *What thinks he of the Religion of the Patriarchs, who received their Religion by Tradition, without any ſuch Infallibility?* 1. Firſt, he thinks it ſomewhat ſtrange, to ſee the Dr plead the certainty of *Oral Tradition* (elſewhere by him ſo much decried) to evade *Church-Infallibility*. 2ly. He thinks, that in thoſe firſt times for their Religion people were not left wholly to *Tradition*, which as to many points of their Religion, could not have afforded them, eſpecially ſuch perſons as had not much converſation abroad, a ſufficient *Certainty* therein: but that, then alſo, they had Prieſts and Prophets endued with Gods ſpirit; and who, as to the Office of Teaching, were not only ſet over them for exhorting them to a good life, but for directing them alſo in all *neceſſary Credenda* and *Truths*, and that the *traditive* doctrine of theſe *Prieſts* ſo aſſiſted muſt be granted much more not to be liable to *errour* in thoſe points, wherein the Tradition of the *people* is thought by the Dr ſufficiently certain: ſo that the more the *certainty* of *Tradition* is eſtabliſhed, the more is confirmed their *Infallibility* alſo, who were the principal Conſervers of it. 3ly. He thinks alſo, that the Church of God had even from the beginning many Poſitive Divine Laws, beſides that of Nature, preſcribing many things in the Worſhip of God. So we find early in *Geneſis* mention of ſeveral laws committed afterward to writing by *Moſes*. See before Note on. p. 85. l. 14. Neither can he ſuppoſe *Oral Tradition* ſuch a faithful and exact Guide in all theſe laws, and to every one ſo well known, and that ſo free from all *controverſy* in neceſſary matters, as to ſuperſede the neceſſity of any *Church-Infallibility*

fallibility in them. But, however it be in the Church under the *Old Teſtament*, the *Promiſes* of an infallible guidance by Gods Holy Spirit to its Governours ſeem much more neceſſary in the *New* for the certainty and ſtability of Chriſtian Religion in all its parts, where is ſuch an *enlargement* made of the *Articles* of *Faith*: and eſpecially, if theſe ſhould not have been committed to writing.

Ib. l. (12) *No ſuch neceſſity of infallibility for that purpoſe.* viz. *for receiving the Scriptures or Churches infallibility by vertue of common and univerſal Tradition.* True: there is no neceſſity of Church-Infallibility to prove or aſſure them of Church-Infallibility, or other points of their faith, ſuch as are ſufficiently evidenced to them by the forementioned *Tradition*. But there is a neceſſity of Church-Infallibility ſtill, (that ſo there may be a ſtability and certainty in them even to the unlearned) as to many other points of Neceſſary Faith, not ſo clear in *Tradition* as *Church Infallibility* is; nor ſo clear, as to be, thereby, ſelf-evident to *all* Chriſtians. As for example, for this point of faith the *Divinity* and *Conſubſtantiality* of our *Saviour*, againſt the *Arian*. Unleſs we may perhaps imagine, that the ſame or greater *Controverſies* in Religion that have riſen notwithſtanding the *Scriptures*, would not ſo, without them, See before Note on p. 84. n. 4. *. Next Obſerve alſo. That *Church Infallibility*, as it is divinely aſſiſted, being a *Divine Revelation*, is, in its delivering to us the other Articles of our faith, much more *relied* and *reſted upon* (in the ſame manner as all other Divine Revelations are) than the *Evidence* of *Tradition* in its delivering to us the ſame *Articles*; though the Ground and Reaſon that ſuch Infallibility is believed to be a Divine Revelation, be Tradition.

Pag. 125. *l.* 1. *For if the Tradition may be a ſufficient ground of faith, how comes Infallibility to be neceſſary?* Thus: *Tradition* may be a ſufficient ground of Faith for ſome points *clearly* delivered by *it*, and as to the perſons *clearly knowing* ſuch Tradition; and yet *Church-Infallibility* be neceſſary for many other points not cleared ſufficiently to *all* men by Tradition. For, things of a ſufficiently generall *Tradition*, which Tradition is repoſed preſently in writings, cannot be ſo well known to all Chriſtians, many neither having learning, nor much converſation abroad, as *Definitions* of a *Council* may.

Ib. l. 7. *And that therein the will of God is contained* &c. *Contained*, but not *clearly*. And this is the reaſon of putting *Church-Infallibility*, notwithſtanding theſe *Divine writings*; which reaſon holds alſo much more for *it*, without *them*.

Ib. l. 17. *That the Church would otherwiſe have failed, if there*

there had been neither Writings, nor Infallibility. Might *have failed,* i.e. by erring in *ſuch* Neceſſaries as are not, as to all, *clearly* delivered by *Tradition.*

Ib. l. (9). *For we ſee God did furniſh the Church with one* [the Scriptures], *and left no footſteps of the other* [Church-Infallibility]. Yes, the *Definitions* of the *Church* contained in the *Athanaſian* Creed are footſteps of it.

Ib. l. ult. Not left us to the determinations of men liable to be corrupted by intereſt and ambition. i.e. Of *Lawful General Councils,* our pretended Infallible Church-Guides.

Pag. 126. *l.* 2. *But hath appointed men inſpired by himſelf to ſet down whatever is neceſſary for us to believe and practiſe.* Add: and hath appointed others, divinely-aſſiſted alſo as to Neceſſaries, to determine both in belief and practice what the former, as to all capacities, have not ſo clearly ſet down, as that *they* may not be therein miſtaken, or alſo by ſome *teachers* miſguided. Witneſs Dr *St.'s* teſtimony hereof *Rat. Account.* p. 58. preſſed by *N.O.* p. 63. where he grants this here ſaid; and upon it allows, (as far as his line will let him go) the ſenſe, that the Catholick Church in ſucceeding ages gives of the Scriptures, to be a *very uſeful* way for them to embrace the true ſenſe of the Scriptures even in Neceſſaries. His own words are—*It ſeems reaſonable, that, becauſe art and ſubtilty may be uſed by ſuch who ſeek to pervert the Catholick doctrine, and to wreſt the plain places of Scripture which deliver it, ſo far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary capacities may be able to clear themſelves of ſuch miſts, as are caſt before their eyes; the ſenſe of the Catholick Church in ſucceeding ages may be a very uſeful way for us to embrace the true ſenſe of Scripture; eſpecially in the great Articles of the Chriſtian Faith. As, for inſtance, in the doctrine of the Deity of Chriſt, or the Trinity.* After which *N.O.* adds there, that the Dr inſtead of ſaying, the ſenſe of the Catholick Church in ſucceeding ages may be *a very uſeful way* for us, might have ſaid, *is very neceſſary for us,* if his cauſe would permit him; and that the *Socinian* would thank him for this his mitigation.

Ib. l. 11. *The fraud and impoſture of the confident pretenders to infallibility.* Viz. Of lawful General Councils.

Ib. l. 12. *Which is the reaſon* &c. They ſpeak evil of Dignities *Jude.* v. 8.

Ib. l. (5) *I confeſs I have ſeen nothing like the firſt evidence yet.* It is ſet down in the precedent page in theſe words—‖ *We may learn firſt this ſupernatural divine aſſiſtance and Infallibility of theſe Governours* (*which is made known by Divine Revelation to theſe firſt perſons who communicate it to poſterity*) *from* Tradition *deſcending*

‖ *Princ. Conſid. p.* 38

ding from age to age; in such manner as the Protestant saith, he learns his Canon of Scripture from Tradition. To which Tradition *also may be committed by our Lord or his Apostles, whatever is, to Scripture.* Perhaps His falling into a Fit of drollery here made him oversee it.

Pag. 127. *l.* 5. *What are its weapons?* See before Note on p. 113. l. 14. n. 4.

Pag. 128. *l.* 3. *It is I suppose agreed on both sides, that the Tradition on which we receive and believe the Scriptures to be the word of God was universal as to all ages, and times.* No. Not so universal, as to *all* parts of the Canon.

Ib. l. 14. *Let any thing like this be produced for the infallibility of the Guides of their Church* [*i.e.* for the Infallibility of lawful General Councils; for *N.O.* the *Considerator* treats of no other, and often mentions this], *and we will yield up the cause to them.* See then what is produced concerning this before, Note on p. 113. l. 14.

Ib. l. (7). *The only argument* &c. That which our Author alledgeth here, the Councils *anathematizing dissenters*, and the *Church's* stiling them *Hereticks* upon it, is only a piece, divided from the rest, of what *N.O.* pressed. *N.O's* words are these (urged by him with application to the Dr's 17. Principle, and without designing any set Discourse on Church-Infallibility) *N.* 1.

|| *That the Governours of the Church* (*who having an apparent succession from our Lord and his Commission, known by Tradition, their testimony must have been unquestionably believed by Christians in what they taught, in case there had been no Scripture*) *always reputed and held themselves divinely assisted, and infallible for all necessaries; and, that this was the traditive faith of the Church* (*grounded on our Lord's Promise*) *in all ages, sufficiently appears, by their inserting from time to time* (*as they thought fit*) *their Decisions in the Creeds, and by their anathematizing dissenters, and the Church's stiling them Hereticks ever after upon it. For that no authority* (if we believe the Dr) *but that which proves it self infallible,* [and therefore which is infallible], *can justly require our internal assent or submission of judgment. And that the Protestants their allowing only an external obedience or silence due to Councils fallible inferrs, that Councils fallible can justly require no more: and, consequently, that such Councils are infallible, as do justly require more; as did the four first Councils, with the voluntary acknowledgment also and submission of their subjects to such an authority assumed by them.* || *Princip.* Consid. p. 39.

After which it follows, to prevent this reply here of the Dr's, *We find indeed subordinate Councils also stating* [*sometimes*] *matters,* *N.* 2.

matters of Faith, cenſuring Hereticks, and requiring aſſent to their Decrees; but ſtill with relation to the ſame Infallibility reſiding in the General Body of Church-Governours, and their concurrence therein: They not paſſing ſuch Acts without conſulting the Tradition and Judgment of other Churches, and eſpecially of the Apoſtolick See: and a general acceptation rendring ſuch their Deciſions authentick and valid. To which may be added what *N.O.* ſaid before *Conſid.* p. 32. where the words of the Dr mentioned here are quoted more at large——*We ſee* (ſaith N.O.) *what kind of Obedience it was, that the firſt four General Councils exacted in the* Athanaſian *Creed, which contains the ſum of their Decrees,* viz. *no leſs than* aſſent, *and* belief, *and* ſubmiſſion of judgment, *and all this upon penalty of damnation.* And this, if juſtly required by them inferrs, upon the Dr's arguing, their Infallibility. *For* (ſaith he ‖) *where Councils challenge an internal aſſent by vertue of their Decrees* [or, becauſe their decrees are in themſelves infallible] *there muſt be firſt proved an impoſſibility of errour in them, before any can look on themſelves as obliged to give it.* Here the Dr paſſeth by ſeveral things urged by *N.O.* of which ſee the former *Diſc.* §. 69. and invades only this part; General Councils their *anathematizing diſſenters*, and *pronouncing them Hereticks*, as he expreſſeth it; though *N.O.* ſpoke of the *Church* always afterwards, ſtiling ſuch Diſſenters from the Councils Decrees *Hereticks*. The Doctors words here, are——*The only argument he inſiſts upon is ſo weak, that I wonder he had not conſidered how often it had been anſwered by their own Writers. For it is certain that Provincial Councils as well as General, have anathematized diſſenters, and pronounced them Hereticks, which is his only argument to prove this Tradition of the Church's Infallibility; and they* [the Catholicks] *had no way to anſwer it, but by ſaying, this doth not imply their Infallibility.* Where he quotes in the margin. *Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 10.*

‖ *Rat. Account*, p. 506

N. 3. To which I have replyed in the former *Diſc.* §. 65. *&c.* (and I think fit here to repeat, at leaſt ſome part thereof, to give the Reader the leſſe trouble, by making frequent References): Firſt in general, that I do not underſtand what it is that our Authour would maintain here againſt *N.O.* Is it this? that neither anathematizing Diſſenters, nor the Councils putting their Decrees in the Churches Creeds, nor the Church Catholick's afterward eſteeming thoſe Hereticks that diſſented from theſe Councils, are a ſufficient evidence or proof that theſe Councils at leaſt (and alſo the Church) *accounted themſelves* Infallible in theſe their Decrees? What could the moſt *Infallible Judge* do or exact more? Doth not he below † blame the Roman Church for aſſuming ſuch an

† *See p.* 113.

an Infallibility to her ſelf, in requiring ſuch a belief of her *Additional Articles* defined in *Trent*, as of *the moſt fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith?* And here, in what hath been urged out of him but now, doth not he grant, the juſt requiring of an *internal aſſent* to inferr *Infallibility*? Or, will he juſtify it lawful for a *Council*, that grants it ſelf *fallible* in ſuch its decrees, notwithſtanding to do all theſe things? And then may not the *Council* of *Trent* rightly do ſo? And laſtly, why doth the *Church* of *England*, as themſelves ſay, forbear ſuch things? I ſay, I ſee not clearly what here the Dr would have.

2*ly*, Coming to that which he preſſeth concerning the practice of *Provincial Councils* anathematizing *Diſſenters*, and yet theſe Councils granted by Catholicks not Infallible; which *Conceſſion* of *Catholicks*, and particularly of *Bellarmine de* Concil *l.* 2. *c.* 10. is produced as ruining this weak argument of *N.O.* that would prove, from Anathematizing Diſſenters, *Infallibility*; Firſt here, *N.O.* conſulting *Bellarmin* he is found (*De Concil. l.* 2. *c.* 3. where he maintains the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*) to urge together with *N.O.* this very *Argument* for it. See his words recited in the former Diſcourſe §. 65. Next; for the objection concerning *Provincial Councils*, *N.O.* had conſidered, and anſwered it thus. ||—*We finde indeed ſubordinate Councils alſo ſtating ſomtimes matters of faith, cenſuring hereticks, and requiring aſſent to their decrees; but ſtill with relation to the ſame Infallibility reſiding in the general Body of Church-Governours, and to their concurrence therein: They not paſſing ſuch Acts without conſulting the Tradition and Judgment of other Churches, and eſpecially of the Apoſtolick See: and a general Acceptation rendring ſuch their Deciſions authentick and valid, ſo as thoſe of General Councils are.* (And *Bellarmin's* anſwer || is ſhewed to be in ſubſtance much-what the ſame). Dr *St.* replies to this, † *That the Anathemas of Provincial Councils did not relate to the acceptation of their Decrees, either by the Pope, or the whole Church, as* N.O. *ſuppoſes, but did proceed upon their own aſſurance of the truth of what they decreed; otherwiſe their anathemas would have been only conditional, and not abſolute and peremptory, as we ſee they were.* Thus He. To which I Anſwer, that, though ſuch Anathemas of Provincial Councils do relate to the general approbation of their Decrees; yet their Anathemas are rightly made not *conditional*, but *abſolute*: either becauſe ſuch a ſufficient *concurrence* with them of the *Catholick Church* is known to them *before* the compoſing their Decree; as it may be, when yet the *confirmation* of their *Act* is only received *after* it: Or, becauſe ſuch poſt-confirmation and acceptarion after-

N. 4.

|| *Conſid.* p. 40.

|| *l.* 2. *c.* 16.

† *p.* 125. *l.* 6.

the penning of the Decree yet precedes the promulgation and juſt force or obligation of it: It being penned abſolute, upon ſuch a conſent preſuppoſed, as we ſee the *Affrican* Anathemas were: and as it is the ordinary cuſtome in all *laws*, the *eſtabliſhment* whereof depends on many *ſucceſſively*, yet in their firſt ſtile to run abſolutely, becauſe ſuch ratification is preſuppoſed to their having the *due force* of Laws. And ſo in General Councils, the *Anathemas* are penned *abſolute*, though theſe Councils and their Decrees have not their full ſtrength till the *Confirmation* thereof by the *See Apoſtolick*, and alſo ſuch an admittance and acceptation of them by the Church-Catholick diffuſive, as is thought neceſſary. Neither is the tranſaction of theſe Moral things to be exacted according to the Rules in *Mathematicks*.)

Pag. 129. *l.* 10. *But did proceed upon their own aſſurance of the truth of what they decreed.* Here, Doth our Author allow fallible Councils, upon a *perſwaſion* they have of the *truth* of what they decree, to anathematize diſſenters; and pronounce them hereticks? Then why may not the Council of *Trent* do ſo? Or, if he means by *their aſſurance*, that Provincial Councils are certain, without relation to any conſent of the whole, that they do not err in ſuch Decrees where they pronounce Anathema, ſo he ſeems to give to theſe *Provincial* Councils alſo an *Infallibility*, more than which Catholicks do not deſire to be allowed to *General*; viz. the certainty that theſe Fathers, met in a General Council, have, whether by the evidence of Scripture, or of Tradition, or of a neceſſary Conſequence from ſomething Traditive, or at leaſt, of our Lords promiſed Aſſiſtance, that they do not err in thoſe things they decree, though in many other things they be fallible.

Ib. l. 14. He goes on thus——*But I need give no other anſwer to this argument than in the words of Dr* Field *whom* N.O. *appealed to* ‖ [but in another matter, not this] *before*, viz. *That Councils denounce anathema not becauſe they think every one that diſobeys the decree of the Council to be accurſed, but becauſe they are perſwaded in particular, that this is the eternal truth of God which they profeſſe, therefore they accurſe them that obſtinately ſhall reſiſt, as S.* Paul *willeth every Chriſtian man to anathematize an Angel coming from heaven, if he ſhall teach them any other doctrine than he hath already learned: yet is not every particular Chriſtian free from poſſibility of erring. If the argument then were good from anathematizing diſſenters, and calling them hereticks, every particular perſon muſt by it be proved infallible who are bound to anathematize even Angels from heaven in caſe of delivering any other doctrine from the Goſpel.*

‖ *Field of the Church. l.* 4. *c.* 4.

Where

Where it is ſaid, firſt, *that theſe General Councils do not denounce anathema* [to diſſenters] *becauſe they think every one that diſobeys the decree of the Council* [i. e. by diſſenting] *to be*, [or to incurr their] *Anathema.* I anſwer to this; that then they muſt hold their Anathema, *univerſally* pronounced, to be, as to *ſuch* perſons, unjuſt: Which I ſuppoſe the General Councils did not. It is ſaid again; that *becauſe theſe General Councils are perſwaded in particular that this is the eternal truth of God that they propoſe, therefore they anathematize them, that obſtinately ſhall reſiſt.* But 1ſt, *N. O.* preſſeth not theſe General Councils their anathematizing them, that ſhall *obſtinatly reſiſt* that which they propoſe; but them, that ſhall *diſſent* from it; and he preſſeth their putting it alſo into the *Creed*, and under anathema requiring from all the belief of it, and that as a matter of faith. 2. I contend, that no Council that only is *perſwaded*, but not certain, that that which it propoſeth (ſuppoſe the *Conſubſtantiality* or *Divinity* of our *Lord*) is the eternal truth of God, can juſtly inſert ſuch point in the Creed or anathematize Diſſenters. But it is agreed that the four firſt Councils did *juſtly* theſe things, and therefore they were not only perſwaded, but certain, that thoſe were truths, and that in them they were infallible, and then much more did hold themſelves ſo, ſince one may think himſelf to be, and yet not be, *infallible.* *N. 1.*

To that which follows out of S. *Paul*, It is anſwered; that S. *Paul* or a *Galatian*, muſt be certain of his not erring in that, for the meer diſſent from which he can juſtly anathematize Angel, or Man: and none may *anathematize* another for his diſſent not receiving, or for his not believing, any thing, of the truth whereof he himſelf is not *certain*; much leſſe, if he doth not ſo much as *hold* himſelf ſo: (which latter will make the fault the greater): Unleſs perhaps ſuch were the ſupreme and unappealable Eccleſiaſtical Judge, and knew that none other could be in ſuch matter certain of the contrary. But this I grant; that who is certain and infallible in ſome things, may not be ſo in all: neither do I contend for an univerſal Infallibility even of General Councils in all things whatſoever, but in all *that are* any way neceſſary to be determined. See Note on p. 104. l. 15. *N. 2.*

Pag. l. 130. *l.* 7. *Let the Reader now judge in his Conſcience*, &c. What thing is there more publick in the Church's Tradition, and of which there hath been *a more remarkable Teſtimony in all ages*, than of the repairing, where the Eccleſiaſtical affaires required, or times permitted it, (following the precedent

of Acts 15.) to *General Councils*, or those some way *equivalent*, for deciding the more important *Controversies* in *Religion* that disturbed the Church: and than, of these Councils, when met, their requiring a belief and assent from all Christians to their Definitions: and this assent accordingly yielded by the *Universal* Church; which inferrs also a General belief and acknowledgment of their *Infallibility*? Aud *Councils* are as well known for, thus, *deciding controversies* in the *Church*, as he saith the Judges are for *trying causes* in *Westminster-Hall*.

Ib. l. (7). *I challenge him to produce any one age, wherein the infallibility of a standing Judge of Controversies, appointed by Christ hath been received by as universal a consent as the authority of Scripture.* Review the last Note. [1] This *standing* Infallible Judge are affirmed to be *Lawful General Councils*. Which though as being a *Court* consisting of *many* it is not at all times actually assembled and sitting, Yet the *Members* of this supreme Ecclesiastical Court are alwaies existent and in being; and retain their Authority from *Christ* for judging matters of Faith equally, whether *conjoined*, or *distant* in place from one another. And, when happens no conveniency of assembling such a General Council, the *Consent* of the Body of the *Catholick* Clergy, manifesting a concurrence in their judgment, whether by several *Provincial* Councils, or by any one, that is *generally* approved; Or, whether by *Communicatory* and *Synodical* Letters; or whether appearing in a general accord in their *publick Writings*, *Catechismes*, and *Explications* of the *Christian Doctrine*, I say such *Consent* is equivalent to a *General Council*. The *Decrees* also and *Definitions* of former *General Councils* are always standing in force, and the execution of them committed to the care of the present Church-Governours. This of the *standing Judge*. [2] As for the Infallibility thereof, the *Universal consent* of the Church hath admitted, as the Authority and Infallibility of *Scriptures*, so of *Councils*, as to their defining points of *necessary* faith: as hath been shewed before, Note on p. 113. l. 14. [3] But, in the 3d place, it is not necessary that *every* point of *Faith*, to have a *sufficient* Attestation or Evidence from *Tradition*, have it *as ample* and Universal as some other point hath; no more than it is for a just ratifying of the *Canon* of *Scripture*, that *all* points of it be shewed to have alwaies had as General an Acceptation, as *any* other: Or, that the Definitions of *Chalcedon* equall, in this, those of *Nice*.

Pag. 131. *l.* 5. *The Infallibility of a standing Judge is utterly denied by one side, and vehemently disputed between several parties on the other.* Not the infallibility of General Councils in all necessaries

neceſſaries *diſputed*, ſave only by ſome Proteſtants agreed in by all the reſt, whether Eaſtern or Weſtern Church. And, if the *Common Reaſon*, or *Body*, of *Chriſtianity* were to decide this conteſt between *N.O.* and Dr *St*, Dr *St.* would be caſt.

Pag. 132. *l.* 15. *If the Infallibility of the Church be as liable to double and diſputes, as that of the Scriptures, it is againſt all juſt laws of reaſoning to make uſe of the Church's infallibility to prove the Scripture by.* It is true; that the *Infallibility* of the *Scripture* cannot be proved from *Infallibility* of the *Church* to any that doubts as much of this as of the other, till this *proof* is alſo proved to them. But then, it is true too, that a Neophyte may firſt be taught from Tradition, the Infallibility of the Church, and from this, ſo made known to him, have the Infallibility of the Canon of Scripture proved to him, as this Church hath in her Councils declared and delivered it; for which Church it were to no end to define the *Canon*, if the Canon thereby received no more certainty, as to any Chriſtian, than formerly.

Ib. l. (3). *N.O. turns my words quite to another meaning.* In the *meaning* the Dr now explains his words, the *ſenſe* of the latter part of this *Principle* (which I leave the Reader to compare) ſeems *coincident* with the former; and ſo is granted to him, as the former is. And, if *N.O.* not imagining ſuch a *reduplication*, miſtook the Drs ſenſe, here, from what he found him to ſay in another place ||, the diſcourſe is ſtill pertinent, if not to this, to the other, place; and *N.O.* hath not loſt his labour. *Princip.* 1^m. || *Rat. Account. p.* 512.

Pag. 133. *l.* 13. *Men can have no certainty of faith that this was a General Council, that it paſſed ſuch decrees, that it proceeded lawfully in paſſing them, and that this is the certain meaning of them; all which are neceſſary in order to the believing thoſe decrees to be infallible with ſuch a faith as they call divine.* Chriſtians have a *ſufficient certainty*, as to all the former *particulars*, that the *Council* of *Nice* (for example) hath delivered [illegible] to be the true ſenſe of the Scriptures; which Senſe of Scripture we believe with a *divine faith*: and this divine faith relies on the word of God, as thus expounded by this Council. The ſame to which therefore may be ſaid as to *other* points, and *other* Councils.

Ib. l. (13). *But I expreſly mention ſuch decrees as are purpoſely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous expreſſions.* His words, in *Rat. Account*, are——*Suppoſe* (ſaith he p. 510.) *we ſhould grant, that you might in general be certain of the Infallibility of General Councils, when we come to inſtance in any one of them, you can have no certainty of faith as to the infallibility of the decrees of it. For you can have no ſuch certainty, that this was a lawful*

a lawful General Council; [2] *that is passed such decrees*; [3] *that it proceeded lawfully in passing them*; and [4] *that this is the certain meaning of them.* Then examining these four particulars, & coming to the 4th, he proceeds thus——*4ly* (Saith he) *Suppose men could be assured of the proceedings of the Council, yet what certainty of faith can be had of the meaning of those decrees? for we see they are as liable to many interpretations as any other writings. If the Scriptures cannot put an end to controversies on that account, how can General Councils do it? when their decrees are as liable to a private sense and wrong interpretation, as the Scriptures are: Nay, much more, for we have many other places to compare, the help of Original tongues, and the consent of the primitive Church, to understand Scriptures by; when the decrees of Councils are many times purposely framed in general terms, & with ambiguous expressions to give satisfaction to some dissenting parties then in the Council.* Which words limited only, *as he saith here*, to *some* decrees of some Councils framed in *general* terms, & with *ambiguous* expressions serve nothing to the purpose of that discourse; and would make his words run thus, for example——*If the Scriptures cannot put an end to controversies on that account, how can General Councils do it? when some of their decrees, by some Councils, that are in general terms and ambiguous expressions, are as liable &c.* Yes: very well, say I, because other decrees, in that, and other Councils, may be clear enough.

Pag. 5340. *l.* 17. *That* [Councils] *ought never to be liable to the same ambiguity.* True: but, if it mis-happen, that Councils be so in some *things*, some of *them*; are they therefore no more serviceable in any *other* things for deciding controversies, where the *sense* of the *Scriptures*, to some at least, is ambiguous, and their *Decision* clear?

Ibid. l. 18. *Upon the account of which obscurity Scripture is rejected from being a certain Rule of faith.* Contrary. Scripture is received by Catholicks for a *certain Rule*; and also in many things for a *clear*.

Pag. 1135. *l.* (8). *In answer to my Lord of Canterbury's adversary &c.* To the reason given for the *Unity* of *Catholicks*, *viz.* their being ready to submit their judgments to the determinations of the *Church* in her *Councils*, our Author returns this reason (as good, or better, he saith) for the *Unity* of *Protestants*, *viz.* their being all ready to submit their judgments to *Scripture*. Which *Reason* since it must needs fail on the *Protestants* side, if the sense of Scripture which serves to unite them, be more ambiguous in several things than that of Councils is, which unites the other, Therefore he labours to make this good, that the *sense* of

Scriptures

Scriptures is not *more ambiguous* than that of Councils. For which see his next page || where he saith — *The meaning of the decrees of Councils, when they are made, raise as many divisions, as were before them; as it appears by the decrees of the Council of Trent.* Where, (in his using *indefinite* terms, as frequently he doth) if he means some of its decrees only, such as he saith are purposely framed in general terms &c, this serves not his purpose; for, so there will still remain a greater *union* amongst *Catholicks*, because of their union in the rest of its decrees, which, how *true* soever they be, are *plain* enough. But, if he means all its decrees, then this is apparently false, *that there are such divisions raised about them.* Now his addition or reply to this, conceding here (which had he done in his *Rational Account*, he had saved *N.O.* some pains in making it good) *that the Roman Church hath some advantage in point of unity; but that all the advantage it hath comes from force and fraud* (of which frequent Maledicency toward his Superiors, and those in so sacred an Assembly, I could wish this Author would make more Conscience) this Concession, I say, is deserting his former Answer to my Lord of *Canterbury's* Adversary as faulty; and passing to another; *viz.* That their Union is indeed greater, but is compassed by *force* and by *fraud*; I suppose he means, of these Councils. But then, since Roman Catholicks are united not only in the Definitions of the *Council* of *Trent*, but of *all*, or be it many of, those that have been within these thousand years; most, if not all of which are rejected by *Protestants*, dares he fasten his *Force* and *Fraud* on all these, and is so; why not a *Socinian* or *Arian* extend it to the *four first* too? Those, whom their cause constrains to disobey authority, will hardly speak well of it.

p. 136.

p. 136.

Annotations on §. 9. The Argument from Parity of Reason.

PAg. 139. *l.* 9. After *N.O's* words — *And are we not here again arrived at Church-infallibility*, [i.e. its not erring in matters of Necessary Faith] *If not from extraordinary divine assistance*, [add, what is left out by the Dr] *Yet from the clearness of the Rule? Only we must suppose such sincere endeavour in the Church, as the Dr allows may be in every private man.*

Pag. 140, *l.* 12. *How doth it hence follow; that the Guides of the Church must be infallible in teaching matters of faith?*

From the *Guides* not *erring*, or not being deceived in matters

ters of faith, it follows not, that they must be infallible, or not deceive, in *teaching* matters of *faith*. Nor are any such words, or consequence, in *N.O.* But it follows well, from the clearness of the same Scriptures to these *Governours*, as much as to *private men*, and from their *endeavours* as well as private mens, to understand them (these two supposed) that the *Church-Governors* cannot *erre* in all necessary matters of faith; (of which necessaries only *N.O.* speaketh) if *private men* cannot; the thing maintained in the Drs *13th Prineiple*. And then, I hope the Drs charity will allow these Governours in a General Council of them at least, not to *teach* contrary to what they *know* and are certain of. And this *Reason* too these Holy Fathers have to do this, because otherwise in their inserting such things, as they thus falsifie, in the *Creeds*, and in their *anathematizing* all *dissenters*, they shall make a publick profession of their *faith* just contrary to their Faith, and anathematize themselves.

Pag. 141. *l.* 8. *The Guides of the Church, supposing the same sincerity, shall enjoy the same priviledge, which I know none ever denied them; but what is this to their Infallibility in teaching all matters of faith? which is the only thing to be proved by him. If he can prove this as necessary for the salvation of mankinde as the other is, then he would do something to his purpose, but not otherwise. So that all this discourse proceeds upon a very false way of reasoning from believing to teaching; and, from Necessaries to salvation, to all matters of faith, which the Guides of the Church shall propose to men.* Thus he. Where, [after I have acquainted the Reader, that *N.O.*'s expresse *words* and *sense* are here corrupted; for, he argues, from particular men's *not erring* in *Necessaries*, by using a sincere endeavour, the Church's *not erring* in *Necessaries*, if using the like: in Necessaries, faith *N.O.*; not in *all* matters of faith, as here the Dr:] It seems, the Infallibility of the Church, he now opposes, is not an Infallibility in *not erring*, or in believing aright in necessaries, here granted to the *Church Governours* in like manner as to *Mechanicks*; but only their Infallibility *in Teaching* to others the same *necessary* things, which they themselves believe: and by their *Infallibility* here is meant not, passively, their not being deceived; but, actively, their not deceiving. And that *N.O.*, in proving these Church-Governours their believing aright in necessaries hath lost his labour: his discourse *proceeding*, as the Dr saith, *from a very false way of reasoning from believing to teaching*. To which that I may not be here further tedious in repeating the same things, I desire the Reader to review what hath been said to this in the former Discourse, §. 38. p. 26.

Ib. l. (9.)

Ib. l. (9.) Urged as *N.O's* arguing——*If God will not be wanting to particular persons in matters necessary to their salvation, much less will he be wanting to the Guides of the Church in all matters of faith.* *N.O.* inferrs or urgeth no such thing. But this is justly inferred: *Not wanting to the Church Guides* in all *Necessary* matters of faith. See note on p. 104. l. 15. Meanwhile, from what motive, thinks this Author, comes that profession of Dr *Hammond* concerning *all matters of faith* ‖——*We do not believe, that any General Council truly such, ever did or shall err in any matter of faith* [he means in defining it]? And that of Bishop *Bramhal* †——*We are most ready, in all our differences, to stand to the judgment of a free General Council.*

‖ *Of Heresy.* §. 14. *n.* 6.

† *Vindic.* c. 2. *p.* 9.

Ib. l. (5). He goes on. *No certainly, unless it be proved, that their guidance is the only means whereby men can understand what is necessary to salvation.* The following words infer, the guidance of Church Governors need to be *no means* of this at all; *God having*, as he saith in the following words, *provided otherwise for that, by giving so clear a Rule in matters necessary, that no man who sincerely endeavours to know such things shall fail therein.* Unless he means the *Rule* to be *clear* so, as that it needs an *Expositor*. But then should not he say, so *obscure* rather (*i.e.* as to some things); and call for a sincere endeavour in private men to learn the sense of it from their *Guides*? and, that they may have the more confidence in their guidance, should not he tell them, with *N.O.* at least, that Scriptures, that are so clear to them, *rude* and *unlearned*, cannot but be so to their Guides, more *versed* and *studied* in *them*?

Pag. 142. *l.* 13. *Besides, that no man that is acquainted with the proceedings of the Council of Trent will see reason to be overconfident of the sincerity of Councils, so palpably influenced by the Court of Rome.* The *sincerity* and *just proceedings* of the *Council* of *Trent* are ill learnt from such persons of a contrary interest. If *all* Bishops, rightly, have an influence on Councils, much more ought the *Prime Patriarch* and other Bishops that assist him.

Annotations on §. 10. *Of the Authority of the Guides of the Church.*

Pag. 142. *l.* (4). *God hath entrusted every man with a faculty of discerning truth and falshood, supposing that there were no persons in the world to direct or guide him.* The Reader may be pleased

ſed to review the brief Replyes, made to what the Dr urgeth here till his page 130, in the preceding Diſcourſe, from §. 40. to 47. *With a faculty of diſcerning truth and falſhood*; Meaneth he, ſo as *every one* to be able to diſcerne truth from falſhood in *every thing*, without any Guide or inſtructer? This is denied. In ſuch indefinite terms lies great ambiguity and deceit.

Pag. 143. *l.* (13). *I hope no one will deny this.* Nor *N.O.* doth not. In ſome truths and falſhoods, more *eaſy*, ones *own* judgment or reaſon may be ſufficient; in others *harder*, not: as, put the caſe, in his judging of ὁμοίσιϑ or, the Articles of the Trinity.

Pag. 144. *l.* 9. *All which were to no purpoſe at all, if men were not to continue the exerciſe of their own judgments about theſe matters*: [viz: matters of Religion.] Exerciſe of private mens judgments in all things General Councils, Church-Governours, *N.O.* allow. For, this alſo is an *act* of our *judgment* when, by it rightly uſed, we find it our duty to ſubmit theſe our judgments (or the particular reaſons we have for, or againſt, ſuch a point in Religion) to the judgment of our *Canonical Superiours* in ſuch matters as are defined by them; and not clear to us.

Ib. l. 11. *Accordingly we find the Apoſtles appealing to the judgments of private and fallible perſons concerning what they ſaid to them.* It is true, All may ſearch all things, and welcome. For all Truths, *among right ſearchers*, bear witneſs one to another. And, after ſuch ſearch, if *rightly* made, they may diſobey, or diſſent from, the contrary doctrine of an *Apoſtle*. Yet this alſo is true, that, whenever they ſhall ſo diſſent, ſuch judgment is not *rightly* made: which the more it is uſed rightly, the more is one confirmed in the *doctrine* of our *Lord* and his *Apoſtles*; and ſo, of *General Councils*. And in all matters not otherwiſe clear to them this *judgment* rightly uſed will ſtill direct them to obedience of their right and Canonical *Paſtors*. But, by this bidding the people *ſearch* and *try*, our *Lord* or his *Apoſtles* ſecured none, if, after it uſed, they either *diſſented* from their *doctrine*, or *diſobeyed* their *commands*: becauſe, in a *right* judgment made of things, they could not do ſo. And therefore the Apoſtles commanded the ſame perſons (as ſuppoſing theſe two things, *belief* of their Doctrine and the *Uſe* of ones *Judgment*, well conſiſting together) to ſtand faſt and firm in the doctrines delivered to them by theſe Apoſtles; and not to be *carried away* with every doctrine, becauſe they had *Paſtors* appointed to guide them; and to obſerve thoſe that cauſed any *Diviſions* among them contrary to the *Doctrine* received; and to *reject* any perſon *heretical*, &c. See *Rom.* 16. —— 1 *Cor.* 11. 2.

11. 2.—*Phil.* 4. 9.—*Heb.* 13. 7.—1 *Tim.* 6. 10.—2 *Tim.* 3. 10. 14—*Tit.* 1. 9.—3. 10.—*Eph.* 4. 11, 13.

Pag. 145. *l.* (10). *They are frequently charged to beware of ſeducers and falſe Guides.* I add, and frequently charged to *follow* their true and Canonical *Church-Governours*, that they may not be miſled by thoſe *falſe* Guides. See the Texts now quoted, to which may be added *Jude* 4. here quoted by our Author.

Ib. l. (7) *They are told, that there ſhould come a falling away*, &c. All this more makes for a moſt cloſe adherence, eſpecially of the more *ſimple* and leſs able to examine *Controverſies*, to their Canonical *Superiours* and for their rejecting the doctrines of thoſe *Spirits*, whom upon trial they find to *oppoſe* them: Being aſſured, from our Lords *Promiſes*, of lawful *General Councils*, the ſupreme Church-authority, their never *erring* in things neceſſary.

Pag. 146. *l.* 9. *Both ſhall fall into the ditch.* We have heard the Dr's plea hitherto. Now, is it any wonder, that *Sects* ſo multiply in a *Church*, where ſuch Pleas as theſe are permitted to be urged in ſuch a ſenſe, as to ſet men at liberty from the *ſubmiſſion* of their judgment to the *Deciſions* and definitions of *General Councils*, upon pretence that there ſhall be *many ſeducers* and *a falling away and departing from the Faith*; and upon pretence of *Force* and *Fraud* uſed in the moſt General Councils that could be convened for many paſt Generations. Which *falling away* and *departing from the Faith*, &c. why ſhould they not be rather applied to theſe *New Sects* and former *Hereſies*; and, from them, be inferred a cloſer adherence and Obedience to their lawful *Church Governours*?

Ib. l. (8). *The Apoſtles told them, they had no dominion over their faith.* What, not ſo far as to oblige them to *obey* and ſubmit to their *Apoſtolical Doctrine*? What not ſuch *dominion* as S. *Paul* urged 1. *Tim.* 1. 20. to the blaſphemers of the *Goſpel*; and, as he commanded *Titus* to uſe, *Tit.* 3. 10.? Conſider the Acts of the Apoſtolical Council. Act. 15. But the Text ſpeaks here of any unjuſt dominion or authority, to treat the faithful as he *pleaſed*, in *puniſhing* or mulcting thoſe, who walk *uprightly* in the faith; to alter, change, cenſure any thing therein, for his own *profit* or advantage. See Dr *Hammond* on the place.

Ib. l. (4.). *No preſent Guides, whatever names they go by, ought to uſurp ſuch an authority over the minds of men which the Apoſtles themſelves did not challenge; although there were greater reaſon for men to yield up their minds wholly to their guidance.* If *to yield up their minds* be to ſubmit their judgments, were not Chriſtians ob-

liged in this to the very *Apoſtles* and *their* Doctrines? See before Note on p. 144. l. 11. See we not the effects here of the Dr's 13th *Principle*; in the people's not needing *Guides* for underſtanding neceſſary *Scriptures*; but meanwhile, in the *Scriptures* being needful to them, for *trying* by it their *Guides*?

Pag. 147. *l.* 7. *Where there is a Rule for them* [the Church-Governours or Guides] *to proceed by, there is a rule for others to judge of their proceedings.* If here He means by theſe others, thoſe, who, doubting of the true ſenſe of the *Rule*, repair to theſe *Guides* to learn from them the true ſenſe of it (which is only to the purpoſe), that theſe are again to *judge* by the *Rule* (doubted of) whether the *Guides* have given the *right* ſenſe, what is this but that theſe are finally to determine the *ſenſe* of the Rule, for the determining of which they conſult their *Teachers*? As if the Conſulters concerning the meaning of a *Law*, when the Judge hath given them the *ſenſe* of the *Law*, ſhould again by this Law examine the truth of the *ſenſe* of the *Judge*, and act finally according to their *own*, not *his*, ſentence.

Ib. l. 13. *Where the rule, by which the Guides of the Church are to proceed, hath determined nothing, there we ſay the authority of the Guides is to be ſubmitted unto. For otherwiſe there would be nothing left, wherein their authority could be ſhewn.* Doth not he ſay here, the *Church's Authority* is to be ſubmitted to in nothing, but things left *indifferent* by the *Scriptures*? Then it hath no authority in determining *Controverſies* of *faith*; but why then ſaith the 20th *Article* of the Church of England, *that the Church hath authority of expounding Scriptures in Controverſies of faith*? and by what authority hath the *Council* of *Nice* determined *Conſubſtantiation*? But, ſo often as the ſenſe of the Scriptures to any is *doubtful*, may not the Scriptures here be ſaid, as to ſuch perſons, to have determined *nothing*? and then are they not in theſe (if in a *Neceſſary* point) to repair to the determination of their *Eccleſiaſtical Guides*? If ſo, all will be well ſtill; and thus all come to ſubmit to the ſentence of the *Judge*, but thoſe who are *certain* before hand of the *ſenſe* of their Rule.

Ib. l. (11). *We plead for the Church's authority in indifferent Rites and Ceremonies.* But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be, whether ſuch *Rites* and *Ceremonies* are indeed *indifferent*? As they are taken by ſome not to be ſo; becauſe God will admit nothing into his *worſhip*, but what himſelf hath firſt expreſly *commanded*, and preſcribed. What *authority* is to end this? I ſay for ſuch who hold ſome *Ceremonie unlawful* and repugnant to Scripture, are they, or the Church, to judge of this *unlawfulneſs*? and, may the

Church

Church lawfully enjoin it, and oblige them, under excommunication, to practiſe it? Or, will it not come at laſt, according to theſe *Principles*, that the Subjects, not the Church, are to decide the *indifferency* or *non-indifferency* of ſuch *Ceremonies*?

Pag. 148. *l.* 7. *Wee allow a very great authority to the Guides of the Catholick Church in the beſt times of Chriſtianity*; *And look upon the concurrent ſenſe of Antiquity as an excellent means to underſtand the mind of Scripture in places otherwiſe doubtful and obſcure. In the beſt times of Chriſtianity.* But do not you then in *all* times? Or, is not their authority the *ſame* in all times? If various, who is *Judge* of this, their *Subjects*?——*As an excellent means to underſtand &c.* This will not ſerve the turn; it muſt be as an *authorized Expoſitor* of the true ſenſe of Scriptures doubtful and obſcure in Neceſſary matters, to whoſe definitions all ought to *ſubmit*; not only, to make uſe of their *advice*. This *Church-Tradition* makes good: this ſuch Proteſtants as our Author oppoſe.

Ib. l. 13. *We reject the ancient Hereſies condemned in them.* But doth he acknowledge and reject *all* that as *Hereſy*, that hath been or ſhall be condemned by *all* lawful General Councils for ſuch?

Ib. l. (11). *We reject nothing, that can be proved by an Univerſal Tradition from the Apoſtolical times downwards. That can be proved.* But who ſhall judge of the *proof*, where any thing is diſputed, whether it be *Tradition*; *Apoſtolick*? Our ſelves, or the preſent Church-Governours?

Ib. l. (5) *We ſee no reaſon to have thoſe things forced upon us now, Which we offer to prove to be contrary to their* [the primitive times] *doctrine and practice. Offer to prove*: To whom? To any whoſe *final judgment* you will ſtand to? Name them. Shall it be to a *General Council*? But, this may err you ſay. It erring, ſhall it be to a *Second*? But, if *one* err, ſo may *all*. And who ſhall judge when It doth not err? *Demonſtration* ſhall decide it. And who judge, when it is a clear *demonſtration*, if any deny it to be ſo?

Pag. 149. *l.* 1. *The Controverſy is, Whether the Guides of the Apoſtolical and Primitive times ought not to have greater authority over us, than thoſe of the preſent Church in things wherein they contradict each other?* Here again, who ſhall *judge* this difference concerning their *contradiction*, denied by *Catholicks*, denied by the *latter Councils* of the Church; that plead *Tradition*, and their agreement with the *former*.

Ib. l. 8. *But we profeſs to yield greater reverence and ſubmiſſion of mind to Chriſt and his Apoſtles than to any Guides of the Church ever ſince: we are ſure they ſpake by an infallible Spirit, and*

where

where they have determined matters of faith & practice, we look upon it as arrogance & presumption in any others, to alter what they have declared. Where they have determined matters of faith or practice. But who's Judge of this, what Christ and his Apostles have determined? the *Church's Councils*; or *private men*, each for himself?

Ib. l. (13). *Til ignorance, ambition, private interests, swayed too much among those, who were called the Guides.* These vices in all ages are found in some; and are justly by others reproved. But doth He charge these on the Church's *Supremest* Guides or its *General* Councils? Then, if we declining their judgment on this *account*, to what other *Courts* or *Persons* will He direct us to apply our selves, that are *more free*? What private Person or inferior Court?

Ib. l. (3). *In matters imposed upon us to believe or practise, which are repugnant to plain commands of Scripture or the evidence of sense or the Grounds of Christian Religion, no Authority of the present Guides of a Church is to overrule our faith or practice. In things contrary to the plain commands of Scripture, or grounds of Religion*; we join with him, *No Church-authority is to overrule our faith or practice.* But, the former Question still returns, Who shall judge among us what is, or is not so contrary? As for the other thing he mentions [*contrary to the evidence of sense*]: If a *Divine Revelation* be contrary to such *evidence*, I hope, our Faith is to be overruled by the *Revelation*; and, for this I think I have the Dr's consent in these words in his *Rational Account*. Where discoursing of *Transubstantiation*, whether consistent with the grounds of Christian Religion, he saith ‖ ——*That which I am now upon is not how far reason* [I suppose he will allow me to say, or sense] *is to be submitted to Divine authority, in case of certainty that there is a Divine Revelation for what I am to believe; but how far it is to be renounced* [that is Reason, or Sense] *when all evidence that is brought* [i.e. for such a Divine Revelation] *is from the authority of the Fathers. So that that Question in short is, Whether there be greater evidence that I am bound to believe the Fathers in a matter contrary to Sense and Reason or else to adhere to the judgment of them, though in opposition to the Father's authority?* Where I understand him to say; that he is to believe a *Divine* Revelation, that is *certainly* such, made known to him by *one* Sense, the *Hearing*; though against the perceptions of *another* Sense the Seeing: but, notwithstanding this, that he is still rather to adhere to the *judgment* of his *Senses*, than credit the *Fathers* concerning the truth of such a Divine Revelation, as contradicts his Senses. So The *certainty*

‖ p. 567

of

of the *Divine Revelation* is here the only thing in queſtion; which once any way proved the evidence *Senſe* gives in againſt it is to be neglected. Now, of the *certainty* of the *Divine Revelation*, or of the true ſenſe of Scripture we reckon the unanimous conſent of the *Fathers* or Primitive Church (if ſuch can be ſhewn) ſo *expounding* it, a ſufficient proof. And I think ſometimes ſo doth Dr *St.* in theſe words *Rat. Account* p. 375.——*We profeſs to be guided by the ſenſe of Scripture as interpreted by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers, and the four firſt General Councils.* And p. 56.——*It is a ſufficient preſcription againſt any thing that can be alledged out of Scripture, that it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture, if it appears contrary to the ſenſe of the Catholick Church from the beginning.* And ſo, laying the *evidence* of *Senſe* here aſide, what *their* conſent is, is the firſt thing to be diſcuſſed.

Pag. 150. *l.* 4. *For there are ſome things ſo plain that no man will be guided by anothers opinion in them.* Catholicks willingly allow withdrawing *obedience* where you have *certainty*. But how vainly doth any one pretend or promiſe himſelf a certainty of any thing, wherein a General Council, or a much major part of the Church, having all the ſame means of certainty as he, judgeth contrary: or fancy that ſuch a matter carrieth the like evidence to perſons, as doth the Whiteneſs of Snow?.

Ib. l. 12. *I am certain, if I deſtroy the evidence of Senſe, I muſt overthrow the grounds of Chriſtian Religion.* What, if I disbelieve Senſe only in ſuch a particular thing, where *Divine Revelation* declares the contrary? Though indeed the *Senſe* in *Tranſubſtantiation* is not deceived at all, its Object ſtill remaining there; but the *Perſon*; if, from it, He collect the *Subſtance* of *Bread* to be under it.

Ib. l. 19. *To reject that authority, which overthrows the certainty of Senſe.* He muſt meane with his Exception; unleſs it be Divine.

Ib. l. (3) *We preferr the grounds of our common Chriſtianity before a novel and monſtrous figment.* Good reaſon: but not before a *Divine Revelation*. This Controverſy therefore muſt firſt be decided, before any argument from *Senſe* can be uſed. He goes on.

Ib. l. (2) *Hutched in the times of ignorance and barbariſme, foſtered by faction and impoſed by tyranny. Speaking evil of Dignities. Jud.* 8. Concerning the evidence of Senſe *N.O.* † had this Diſcourſe on Dr *St's. 4th Conſequence* charging the Church of *Rome* as maintaining opinions repugnant to the *principles* of *Senſe* and *Reaſon*. 1. That the *judgment* of our *Senſes*, appointed

† *Conſid. p.* 92.

pointed by God the Inſtruments (by hearing, or reading, them) of conveying Faith, and his Divine Revelations to us, affords a ſufficient natural *certainty* or *infallibility*, whereon to ground our *belief* in all thoſe things ſubject to our ſenſes, wherein the *Divine Power* doth not interpoſe. But 2ly. That, where the Divine Power worketh any thing *ſupernaturally*, that is, contrary to our ſenſe (as it may, no doubt) here we are not to believe them. And 3ly. That we are to believe this *divine power* doth ſo, ſo often as certain Divine Revelation tells us ſo; though by the ſame *ſenſes* it tells us ſo. We believing our Senſes (as our Hearing or Reading) for this (as we ought, where we have no Divine Revelation or other evidence concerning their deception) when at the ſame time we do not believe the ſame Senſes for ſome other thing, (as, that that which we ſee is Bread) when a *Divine Revelation* tells us the *contrary*. The *truth* of which Divine Revelation, in any non-evidence and queſtioning of the Senſe of Scripture, we are to learn from *Gods Church* infallibly aſſiſted in neceſſary Faith *&c.* For which I referr the Reader to what hath been ſaid more at large in §. 60. 61. 62. of the preceding Diſcourſe. Thus *N.O.* in his *Conſiderations* || which the Dr paſſeth over in ſilence. For, it is better not to debate or acquaint a Reader with thoſe Scruples we cannot eaſily ſatisfy; *Coſa ragionata via và.*

P. 151. *l.* 1. *We find no command ſo plain in Scripture that we muſt believe the Guides of the Church in all they deliver, as there is, that we muſt not worſhip Images.* See the *Scriptures* declaring *Church-Infallibility* as to *Neceſſaries* and commanding obedience to it, cited before in Note on p. 113. l. 14. The Scriptures that prohibit *worſhiping* of *Images* do ſo of any *Creature* in heaven, earth, or under it: but meane a *Divine* and *Soveraign* Worſhip of them, not ſuch a *Worſhip* as we ſay is lawfully given to *Men*; or *veneration*, as is given to *Sacred* Things, *Temples*, *Altars*, *Goſpels*, &c. He goes on.

Ib. l. 5. *That we muſt pray with underſtanding.* Therefore are all *publick Formes* of *Prayer* that are thought neceſſary for the *vulgar* by Catholicks tranſlated and publiſhed in the *vulgar* tongue; and by thoſe who can read communicated to others.

Ib. l. 6. *That we muſt keep to our Saviours Inſtitution of the Lords Supper.* Surely no *Precept* obligeth us to our *Lords Inſtitution* or *Practice* in every thing; not, in *communicating* after *Supper*, *Sitting* at table, taking it into our *hands*, *waſhing* of *feet* before it, nor in communicating always in *both* kinds; a thing ſufficiently cleared by the practice of *Antiquity* and pureſt times; which on ſeveral occaſions, and that where no *abſolute* neceſſity,

gave

gave it in *one* kind only, (believing our Lord's *Body* and *Blood* to be received in any *one Species*. Now, where a Divine Precept obligeth, the contrary Practice in *no* time would be lawful. The Eastern Churches also, for the same reason as the West, *viz.* : to prevent the many *abuses* and *irreverences* that have hapned since Christianity so exceedingly populous, communicate the people, not by their *eating* our *Lord's Body* and *drinking* his *Blood* apart, but by giving them both these together taken out of the Chalice with a little *Spoon*, and so putting it into their mouths : and think herein they transgress no *Precept*. So *Jo.* 6. 53. is not understood as a precept extending to *all*; for, so it would to *Infants*. Nor that *Jo.* 13. 14. Or *Jam.* 5. 14. 15. Or *Matt.* 6. 17.——5. 34. and such like.

Ib. l. 7. *But if any Guides of a Church pretend to an authority to evacuate the force of these* [the Divine] *Laws &c. Evacuate*, i.e. in the sense you take them in; standing to no certain *Judge* concerning this sense.

Ib. l. 15. *If they require things contrary to a direct command of God. Contrary*, i.e. in your, mistaken, private judgment.

Ib. l. 18. *If they* [the Guides] *can prove us mistaken, we yield.* No, surely. Your own sobereſt Writers say; you are to obey and submit your judgment to that of your Guides, except you can *prove*, (and that demonstratively; and that demonstration such as is allowed by all rational persons,) *them* to be *mistaken*.

Ib. l. (8). *I would gladly know whether there be not some points of faith, and some parts of our duty so plain, that no Church-authority determining the contrary ought to be obeyed.* And will not then those also be so *plain*, as that no *Church-Authority* will determine the contrary? This granted then, that there are points of faith so plain; yet it is contended, that *none*, wherein General Councils require our obedience, are contradictory to any such *plain point of faith*. How can that be maintained by any a plain *truth* to the *common reason* of mankind, which a *General Council*, and a major part of the Church accepting this Council denies, as *false*? And, if it be said, that passions and interests blind men; we ought to imagine, they do so *private* men, or our selves sooner, than *General Councils*. In this 7th Proposition p. 149. what hath our Author said in defence of *his* Religion against *Church-Authority*, that a *Socinian* or *Arian* may not say for *his*?

Pag. 152. *l.* 12. *These Guides of the Church have declared each other to be fallible by condemning their opinions and practices. Lawful General Councils* have not condemned the opinions of one

another. And, what former Councils have been held for *lawfully General*. Where any doubt is made, it is fit private men ſhould learne from their preſent ſupreme *Eccleſiaſtical Guides*. Thoſe Councils urged for this contradiction by Proteſtants, are either *Particular*, againſt *General* Councils; or Councils ſtiled General, that are not allowed to be ſo by the judgment of the *preſent Church Catholick*: Or thoſe *definitions* of them to contradict, which do not, in the foreſaid judgment; or opinions *commonly-received* only in ſome age urged for ſuch *defined*.

Ib. l. 18. *Suppoſe a man Living in the times of the prevalency of Arianiſme, when almoſt all the Guides of the Church declared in favour of it.* *Arianiſme* at no time prevailed upon a *greater* part of the *Church* or its Governours. That of S. *Jerome*——*Ingemuit totus orbis, & miratus eſt ſe eſſe Arianum* only ſignifies, that the whole Catholick world wondred, that its *Decree* which paſſed in the great *Council* at *Ariminum* was interpreted by the *Arian* party, which was favoured by the *Emperour*, quite contrary to its meaning. Doth the Dr as yet doubt of this? He goes on.

Ib. l. ult. Muſt he adhere to the Nicene Council? but there were more numerous Councils, which condemned it. Yes; he muſt. Becauſe thoſe *Arian* Councils, if any more numerous for the *Biſhops* that were preſent in them, (Whereas there were but a very few of the Weſtern Biſhops preſent in the Council of *Nice*) yet had not ſo general an *acceptation*, eſpecially in the *Occidental Churches*. As for any *illiterate* vulgar, that have not a ſufficient means of diſtinguiſhing *lawful* General Councils from others not ſo that contradict them, they are excuſed, by their *invincible* ignorance, till further light, for any non-conformity to their *Decrees*. And generally, where any diſpute concerning the authority of a Council is, private men may ſo long ſuſpend their obedience to their decrees, till a ſufficiently general acceptation or reprobation of ſuch Councils by the Church-Governours and the *Biſhop* of the *Apoſtolick See*, of the ſame, or the ſucceeding times, have cleared ſuch difficulty. But ſuch a general Acceptation and confirmation of this *Council* of *Nice* was manifeſt immediately after the ſitting thereof. And of this thoſe who made any doubt ought to have informed themſelves better. But meanwhile, by this Queſtion doth not this Authour fairly free a *Socinian* from any obedience due to the decree of the *Nicene Council* concerning *Conſubſtantiality*?

Pag. 153. *l.* (4.) Liberius *went ſo far, that* Hilary *denounced an Anathema againſt him, and all that joined with him.* The N. 1. Relation in which this paſſage is found is none of S. *Hilary's*. See the

thereasons given by *Baronius A. D.* 357. The Historians of those times differ in their Records concerning *Liberius*; some speaking more favourable of him, than others. The *Syrmian Confession* subscribed by him may be taken in an orthodox sense, and it is justified as such by S. *Hilary*||. And, if he communicated only with such a party, as those called *Semi-Arians* who joined with him in this profession, though understood by them in a sense different from his, his *fault* seems hereby much *extenuated*, as that of some Catholick Bishops doing the like after the Council of *Ariminum*, was by S. *Jerome*. See his *Dialog. adversus Luciferianos*. But, however *Liberius* might miscarry no prudent Catholicks could then deliberate, Whether they were to follow the judgment of him a *single Pope*, rather than of a preceding *Pope* and a *lawful General Council*: I mean, that of *Nice*. || *De Synod*

Meanwhile, by the following *discourse* in this *Author* here for twenty pages together, we see, notwithstanding what he had said before p. 148.——*That Protestants profess a great reverence*, &c. *to General Councils, and reject the ancient heresies condemned in them*; And——that *the controversy between us is not about the authority of the Guides of the Church, but whether the Guides of the Apostolical and Primitive times ought not to have greater authority over us; than those of the present Church in things wherein these contradict* them; we see, I say, what way his *Interest* chiefly carries him in raking into the same *Antiquity*, he so commends, with great diligence, even in the times of the first four or five General Councils, to expose any *Contradictions* he can find in these times so to the common view, as to reduce men, drawn off from *obedience* to their *Guides*, to the use and direction of their *own Judgment*: perusing the Scriptures (as the Socinians do) for what tenent they shall rather hold in our Lord's *Consubstantiality* with the *Father*, after the Decision of *Nice*; and in the *Two Natures* and *One Person* of our Lord after the Definitions of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*; telling us, that neither [illegible] was settled by the one; nor the *Two Natures* and *One Person* by the other, so, but that the Guides of the Church, after these Councils, *contradicted* one another. And meanwhile——*What advice* (saith he, speaking of the times after the Council of *Nice*†) *would* N.O. *give to a private man, if he must not exercise his own judgment, and compare both the doctrines by the Rule of Scriptures?* And||——*What remedy* (saith he) *can be supposed in such a case, but that every person must search and examine the several doctrines according to his best ability, and judge what is best for him to believe and practise?* Thus he after the setling of such doctrines by these General Councils. Which if he speaks of persons *N. 2.* † *p.* 152. || *p.* 153.

ſuſpending their judgments only during ſuch time till there is a ſufficient evidence of the *ſupremacy* and *Legality* of ſuch a Council, is not denied him: But, if he ſpeaks of *all* times after the legal authority of ſuch a *Council* is cleared (as that of *Nice* immediatly was) which only makes to his purpoſe, all then are to yield ſubmiſſion of judgment to its *decrees*. See Note on page 144. l. 9. and 11. And this eager agitating and preſſing the differences and *contradictions* in *Antiquity*, diſcloſing their infirmities and oppoſitions, whilſt Catholicks endeavour to unite and to reconcile them, doth it not argue a *party*, that is much pinched, if, I ſay not the *Decrees* and ſanctions of the preſent, but of the *Ancient*, Church-Authority be maintained?

N. 3. An exact Review hereof our Authors Stories, wherein he knows ſeveral *Roman* Writers much differ from him, freeing both *Liberius* and *Honorius* from *Hereſy*, and wherein it is very difficult for any from his or my relations, without examining many other *Authors*, to diſcern the truth, ſutes not well with theſe *ſhort Notes*; and would be, in diſcuſſing ſo many *particularities*, very tedious to the Reader; and laſtly ſeems a *needleſs* task. For, [1] for the *Infallibility* of *Popes*, the great *Common place* of Proteſtants, (and which he brings here into the diſpute, as one would think, but that more may be expected from his Ingenuity, that ſo, in the great duſt he raiſeth about it, he might run away from the direct matter of the *Conſiderations*), it is a thing wholy declined by *N.O*; nor is there a word of it in all his *Conſiderations*; nor is he neceſſitated, by any *Poſition* of his, to defend it: and I think *Bellarmine*, in the diſcuſſion of it, grants, that, if no *Pope* ever yet hath been, a Pope poſſibly may be, an Heretick.

N. 4. [2] Next, for the Queſtion, When *Councils* and *Popes* oppoſe and contradict one another, which of theſe Guides Chriſtians are to obey? It is anſwered, That ſubmiſſion of judgment is only required to ſuch *Decrees* when theſe two are firſt *united* and agreed; and, I think, our Author will not be offended at it, if till ſuch time Chriſtians, as to thoſe points that are in debate between theſe two, are left to their *liberty*: &, if *Proteſtants* will ſubmit to the *Deciſions* of ſuch former Councils, wherein there hath been no ſuch *oppoſition*, more is not required. And, in any contradiction, that may happen between a *General Council* already confirmed by the *See Apoſtolick* and any ſucceeding *Pope*, if any ſuch difference ſhould be, the former Decree of a Pope *joined* with a General Council will doubtleſs preſcribe to any contrary one of a Pope *ſingle*. Laſtly, If the *Councils* of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon* were not generally ſubmitted to; and ſo, as to ſome Party, were ineffectual for the *ſuppreſſion*

preſſion of the *hereſies* they condemned, yet ought they to have been ſo admitted and obeyed by all after that their Decrees have received a ſufficient validity from their being accepted by a much *major part* of the *Church*, and confirmed by the *Biſhop* of *Rome*: and I hope our Author will not deny this, leſt Chriſtians totter ſtill in ſome of the *Articles* of the *Athanaſian Creed*. This ſaid here I hope may ſave me ſome labour in reſpect of that which follows, truſting the ingenuous Reader with the application.

P. 156. *l.* (6) *I now deſire to know what a perſon in that time ſhould do, who was bound to yield an internal aſſent to the Guides of the Church?* He is obliged to follow the judgment of the Church-Guides in ſuch a Council after a ſufficient Acceptation of it by the Church Catholick diffuſive and confirmation of the See Apoſtolick. As this *Fifth Council* had after ſome time by *Vigilius* and his *Succeſſors* and by the *Sixth Council* Act. 17. and 18. and in after times both by the *Greek* and *Latin* Church in the *Council* of *Florence* Seſs. 5. at *Ferrara*. And, till ſuch Confirmation or Acceptation appeared, a private man might ſuſpend his judgment, or hold what to him might ſeem moſt probable concerning the *Trium Capitula* their agreeing or diſagreeing with the Doctrine and faith of the *Council* of *Calcedon*; to the *Definition* of which both the differing Parties willingly conſented, whilſt one endeavoured, that the *errour* of ſuch particular perſons here concerned might no way prejudice the *doctrine* of that *Council*: the other, that the *perſons*, whom after ſome former errours this *Council* had approved, might not be afterward *condemned*.

Pag. 163. *l.* 12. *And after theſe to anathematize* Honorius, *as agreeing in all things with* Sergius, *and confirming his wicked doctrines.* Here, what ſhould I trouble *my ſelf* or the *Reader* in debating this controverſy concerning *Honorius* with the *Dr*? whoſe cauſe the Reader may ſee pleaded very plauſibly by *Cardinal Bellarmine l.* 4. *de Romano Pontifice* c. 12. as to this freedome from *Hereſy*; being condemned hereof after his *death*, before any *Council* had defined this matter, upon ſome *words* of his, which, compared with others, are capable of a *ſound* meaning; as arguing not againſt *two*, but two *contrary* or *repugnant*, *Wills* of our *Lord*; and whenas there is ſome matter of *fact* (in which may be miſtakes) contained in the Council's thus declaring him an *heretick*, which thing occurs not in the declaring of *Hereſy*. I ſay, what need I review this debate, wherein the Dr only contends, *that is*; which the common opinion among Catholicks grants, *may be*. See *Bellarm. de. Rom. Pont. l.* 4. c. 10. §. *Reſp. Sunt*——*Pighius contendit Papam non poſſe eſſe Hæreticum, proinde*.

proinde nec deponi in ullo casu, quæ sententia probabilis est & facilè defendi potest, tamen non est certa: & communis opinio est in contrarium. Where he quotes also the Canon, *Si Papa Distinct.* 40. *Papa a nemine judicandus, nisi deprehendatur a fide devius.*

Pag. 167. *l.* 4. *Pope* Agatho *did himself consent to the condemnation of* Honorius. Suppose this be granted, why may not a *Pope* and a *General Council*, judge a *Pope*? See for this again *Bellarm. de Concil. l.* 2. *c.* 19.——*Potest Concilium discutere causam Pontificis: &, si inveniat revera esse infidelem, potest declarare eum esse extra Ecclesiam, & sic damnare.* And the same he saith: If the Council should discover him an *Heretick*, *De Conc. l.* 1. *c.* 9.—— *Quarta causa celebrandi Generalis Concilii est suspicio Hæresis in Romano Pontifice*, &c.

Pag. 168. *l.* 19. *The greatest strength he adds to* Baronius *is only saying*, without doubt it is so. Let the Reader view *Bellarmin de Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 11. whether this hath not more drollery in it, than Truth.

Pag. 170. *l.* 18. *I desire therefore again to know whether he was rightly condemned, or not.* Suppose I answer, rightly; what then? Then the Pope is not *infallible*. And what then? What is this to *N.O*; or his *Considerations*?

Ib. l. (8). *In either case there was no Infallibility in the Guides.* Yes, in one case; if *Honorius* rightly condemned, there was *Infallibility* in the *Pope* and *Council*.

Pag. 171 *l.* 8. *The ingennous concession of* Mr White. A great friend to *Popes*. But, by this, (he sees) there are, that confess Popes liable to Heresy.

Ib. l. (6.). *Councils against Councils.* Not *lawful General* Councils, one against another.

Ib. l. (4.). *Church against Church, especially after the Breach between the Greek, and the Roman.* Not one of these Churches against the other, in most of those things for which the *Reformation* hath left the *Roman*. But, supposing in *some* points they be so, the *Infallibility* we contend for here as requiring our Obedience is only that of a General Council, joined with and confirmed by the Bishop of the *See Apostolick*. In the intervals of which Councils, to matters clearly *determined* formerly by them the present Church Governours, if no way supposed infallible, may exact from the Church's subjects such an *assent* as the Councils have required. Or, in new Controversies arising, and not formerly determined by any such Councils, yet may justly impose *silence*, till such Controversy shall be so decided.

Ib. l. (2). *But a man, who is bound to rely only on the authority*

thority of his Guides must suppose them to be agreed; and, in case of difference among them, he must first chuse his Religion; and, by that, his Guide. Bound to rely only. Who saith it? He may rely on the *Holy Scripture* very safely in all points whereever it is clear: but, in his application to it, when he meets with *Scriptures*, the *sense* whereof is *ambiguous* to him, (as surely either it is or should be, in case he sees a major part of the Church, or of Christianity, to differ from him in the *sense* of it) he is to rely on his *Guides*. And next, in any difference among them, he is not presently left to our Author's way, *to chuse his Religion*, or his opinion first, and *by that*, *his Guides*, as they fit it: for so, in some places that our Author knows, there is scarce any opinion so gross, but *some* Guides may be found *complying* with it. But in these Guides differing, and their *just* authority consisting in a most exact *Subordination*, he is to rely on the *Superiour*; (as in *England* on a *Provincial*, or *National* Synod, rather than on the *Rector* of his *Parish*, or a *single Bishop*): and, whereever its judgment can be had, on the *Supreme*; a lawful *General Council*, confirmed by the *Bishop* of the *See Apostolick*.

Pag. 172. l. (8.) *Now the Question proposed is, whether it be not fitter for me to submit to the Guides of the Catholick Church, than to trust my own judgment? I should make no scruple in all doubtful matters to resolve the affirmative, supposing that all the Guides of the Catholick Church were agreed.* Will he submit his judgment, then, to lawful *General Councils*, and the matters they have or shall *agree* in? Since he hath great reason to *doubt* in all things, where they judge *contrary* to his tenent. He goes on.

Ib. l. ult. For I should think it arrogance and presumption in me to set up my own private opinion in opposition to the unanimous consent of all the Guides of the Catholick Church, in such a case.

To the unanimous consent of all the Guides. But will he submit to such a *consent* as hath been had in former *lawful General Councils*, I mean such as in the *four first*, for deciding Controversies: *viz.* to that of a much major part? For, else, if but *one* Bishop in the world shall oppose *all* the rest, He is released from such his *submission*. And, lastly, Will he yield this for all matters whatever such Councils shall define? For (to repeat his words) ought he not to *think it arrogance and presumption in him to set up his own private opinion in opposition to such* Councils in any thing, for which they have the same evidence as himself? And here observe also, that, in whatever times these Councils be held; whether in the present or past, ancient or latter, times, (so as not contradicting one another, in their definitions,) their *Authority* is exactly the

same;

ſame; and ſo ought his *Obedience* to be; and their *Definitions* alſo to be, in all times after, obliging: thoſe of *Nice*, obliging now.

N. 1. *Pag.* 173. *l.* 5. *We find the Chriſtian world divided into very different Communions.* It is ſo. But the foremention'd ‖ *ſubordination* of Church-Governours is ſtill to be obſerved. And our obedience, in any claſhing of theſe *Church-Governours* in ſeveral parts, to be performed to the *Superiours*. As for example. The *African Biſhops* and their *Councils*, differing about *Rebaptization* from other Chriſtian Churches, were, obſerving their ſubordination, to ſubmit to the judgment of a Council *Oecumenical*. A private man then, where are many different *Churches* and *Communions*, ought to conſider under what particular Governours he liveth, and in what manner they are *ſubordinate* to others; and accordingly (in any differences happening about points which he is not at *leiſure* to ſtudy, or hath not *capacity* to underſtand, or, after ſtudy, is not *certain*, on any ſide) to yield his obedience, and ſubmit his judgment to the Superiours. As in *England* a diviſion happening in the Clergy thereof, I ſuppoſe our Anthor would adviſe one that thus doubts in a point controverted, in caſe the Parſon of his Pariſh oppoſeth the Biſhop of the Dioceſe, or this Biſhop all the other Biſhops of the Province; or of the Nation; to ſubmit to the judgment of the Biſhop, or of the Provincial, or National Synod, rather than to his Parſon. And that He would not enjoin ſuch private perſon, or tell him he is obliged for the ſettling of his judgment, to ſtudy the whole Controverſy debated between ſuch *Parſon* and his *Biſhop*; to collate their arguments *&c*; and then, make himſelf Judge, at leaſt for himſelf, which of them is in the right: wherein alſo, ſhould it be done, the *incapacity* of the man, or alſo his *paſſion* or *intereſt* on one ſide, may eaſily misguide him, and he fare much worſe by his *liberty*, than his *obedience*. And this thing ſeems alſo intended by the *National* Synod of *England* in their drawing up the 39. *Articles*, (they ſay), for taking away Diverſity of Opinion; which thing they do not there pretend to effect, * by their confuting, with arguments *ſatisfactory* to their *ſubjects*, all thoſe opinions they there diſallow; for, no ſuch ſatisfaction is offered, no ſuch thing is done by them; but * by the ſubmitting of their ſubjects, not skilled in ſuch matters, nor certain of the contrary, to their *Judgment*, as the *Supreme* of this *National* Church.

‖ *Note on p.* 172. *l.* (2.)

N. 2. The ſame, then, let any doubting perſon do in any higher diviſion and oppoſition of *Metropolitan* Churches, ſuppoſe in the *Weſtern* Patriarchy wherein he lives. Let him examine which is the moſt *Univerſal* Body of them, which the moſt *dignified* Perſons,

Perſons, and ſubmit to their Guidance; which as it is more ſafely relyed on may be eaſilier *examined*, than the *Controverſies*: and indeed is a caſe clear and obvious enough to the moſt of men. And, as for others, their invincible ignorance it is hoped, may excuſe their errour. Where alſo let ſuch a perſon conſider; whether ſuch Councils, as are aſſembled of moſt of the *National* Churches in the *Weſt* joined with the Patriarch of it, and deciding the many points diſputed in theſe Weſtern parts, are not to be ſubmitted to by all private perſons, not certain of the contrary to their Deciſions (as how ſhould they be ſo?), before a *National* only of the *Engliſh Biſhops*; eſpecially, if theſe oppoſing them in thoſe things, wherein for the moſt part the Eaſtern Churches alſo agree with them. And, if any here, for ſtanding out againſt this *major authority*, ſhould plead *Certainty* on his ſide, as Archbiſhop *Laud* and others do, then let him conſider, how few there are among Chriſtians ſo well ſeen in all theſe Controverſies themſelves, as to withdraw their obedience on this *account*; whilſt it ſeems agreed that all others ought, leaving theſe *Certainiſts* by themſelves, to conform to the Decrees of the *Superiour Courts*?

Ib. l. (10). *What then makes theſe Churches* [the Eaſtern] *to be left out in our enquiries after the Guides of the Catholick Church*? How orthodox and Catholick ſoever the *Eaſtern* Churches may be, one living in the *Weſtern* Church owes no Canonical ſubjection or obedience to them: whoſe whole care it ought to be to pay it where it is due according to the forementioned *ſubordination*; which done, he cannot miſcarry as to all *neceſſary Faith*. But however, I think, Dr *St.* might have ſpared the Deſcription, and propoſal of theſe to a *Proteſtants* choice, by reaſon of their many tenents in the Points controverted, and particularly in thoſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and the *Idolatry of Images* and *Invocation of Saints*, agreeing with, or alſo ſome of them more diſliked, than the *Roman*.

Pag. 174. *l.* (9). *Now of theſe five parts four of them* [Neſtorians, Eutychians, Greeks, and Proteſtant Churches] *are all agreed, that there is no neceſſity of living in ſubjection to the Guides of the Roman Church.* As they are agreed, ſo it is granted. For Example, that the *Metropolitan Church* of *England* owes no ſubjection to the *Metropolitan* Church, of *Rome*, nor to the Pope, as the *Metropolitan* thereof. And the other *three* owe him no *ſubjection* neither as he is Patriarch of the *Weſt*, but the *fourth* doth; and yielded it together with other Occidental Churches, till of late. But, meanwhile, the Eaſtern Churches, are agreed, that they owe all ſubjection and ſubmiſſion of judg-

ment to the *Definitions* of *lawful General* Councils, (and on this account render it to the 2d *Nicene*) and that these Councils are infallible in them; (for which see what is cited in the precedent *Discourse* §. 56.) And, from the determination of these Councils, do the same Churches entertain several Opinions rejected by Protestants.

Ib.l. (3.) *Only those of the Church of Rome take upon themselves against all sense and reason to be the Catholick Church; and so exclude four parts of five out of a capacity of salvation.* The *Roman* Church confesseth it self a particular Church, and only a *part* of the *Catholick*. Nor doth it exclude any other Churches from being true parts thereof, save those which are *Heretical*, or *Schismatical*; both which Hereticks and Schismaticks, I think, learned Protestants exclude also from being members of the Catholick Church. See Dr *Field* l.4.c.2.——*That the Visible Church* [he means, Catholick] *never falleth into Heresy we most willingly grant.* And l.1.c.7.——*The name of Orthodox Church is applied to distinguish right-believing Christians from Hereticks; the name of the Catholick Church, men holding the Faith in unity from Schismaticks.* Nor doth the *Roman* Church deny in such *Heretical* or *Schismatical* Churches a capacity or possibility of salvation to *all* generally; but only (as I think *Protestants* also do) to those among them that are formerly guilty of the *crimes* of *Heresy*, or *Schisme*: because indeed either of these is a *mortal* sin; and so, unrepented of, excluding from *salvation*. Lastly, *Heretical* the Roman Church, with all *Antiquity*, takes those to be, that maintain the contrary to any known *Definition*, in a matter of faith, of a lawful General Council: and *Schismatical* those, that, upon any cause whatever, do separate from the *Communion* of the present Church Catholick, and their true *Superiour* Ecclesiastical Guides.

Pag.175.l.11. When he finds so many [Churches] *and those not inferiour to the Roman Church in any thing, save only in pomp, pride, and uncharitableness.* Eph.4.31. *And evil-speaking be put away from you. Et blasphemia tollatur a vobis cum omni malitiâ.*

Ib.l.13. All (saith He) *opposing Infallibility in it.* In the Church of *Rome*; but not in the *Church Catholick*; which or wheresoever, it be. He proceeds.

Ib.l.15. What reason can he have, supposing that he is to submit to any Guides, that he must submit only to those of the Roman Church? Why not as well to those of the Eastern, Greek, or Protestant Churches? *Persons*, and *Churches*, are to submit only to their lawful *Canonical Superiours*, *Persons*, or *Councils*. And so,

to are to avoid ſuch Perſons, or Churches, as theſe do *declare Heretical*, or *Schiſmatical*; whom they come to know, or are to believe, to be ſo, from ſuch *Declaration* without a neceſſity of ſtudying the particular Controverſies: the Supreme Court of which *Superiours*, a General Council of theſe Church-Guides, cannot misguide them in any thing *neceſſary* to be known: and the *Decrees* alſo of others *inferiour*, though fallible, yet in all prudence are to be obeyed and believed, wherever themſelves have no *Certainty* of the contrary. It follows.

Ib. l. (11.) *If any one goes about to aſſign a reaſon, by charging them with Hereſy or Schiſme, He unavoidably makes him Judge of ſome of the greateſt difficulties in Religion, before he can ſubmit to his infallible Guides.* No. For, by *other ways* forementioned || a private perſon comes to know his true Guides and Superiours, and from them learns what is, and what perſons are guilty of, *Hereſy* and Schiſme. Elſe all men muſt turn Students in Divinity, or know nothing of Hereſy, or Schiſme. He proceeds.

|| *See Note on p.* 173. *l.* 5

Ib. l. (7). *He muſt know what Neſtorianiſme, Eutychianiſme, Monotheliſme mean.* This being ſuppoſed, that all *Hereſies* and *Schiſms* are to be avoided by all good Chriſtians, I ſee not, without dependence on our *Guides* for knowing theſe, but that all Proteſtants are obliged by this Author to take the courſe he here ſets down through two or three pages. Let him conſider better on it. Unleſs he will make all Hereſy and Schiſme *manifeſt* to *all* men, learned, or unlearned, upon the vertue of his 13th *Principle*.

Pag. 177. *l.* 6. *All theſe things a man muſt fully be ſatisfied in, before he can pronounce thoſe Churches guilty of Hereſy; and ſo not to be followed.* See Note on p. 175. l. (10).

Ib. l. 10. *Why muſt the Greek* [Church] *which embraces all the Councils which determined thoſe ſubtile controverſies,* [be rejected]? The *Greeks* embracing theſe Councils, may lawfully be rejected for Hereſy, if oppoſing what other like Councils have defined: and ſo may the *Proteſtants*: or yet either of theſe, if guilty of *Schiſme*.

Ib. l. (12). *Here a man muſt examine the notes of the Church* &c. i.e. *Examine* ſome Indications and *marks* of it, ſufficient to ſway and determine his judgment. Which examination is eaſy and obvious (See before Note on p. 173. l. 5.) without his ſtudying that particular Note of *its Conſent with Primitive Church*. Of which thus *N.O.* had ſpoken before p. 89. after having recited S. *Auſtins* common Marks—*Where alſo*, (ſaith he) *according to the diſparity of ſeveral mens capacities, I ſuppoſe nothing*

more to be necessary, than that this evidence, received either from all, or only some of these Notes (to those who have not ability to examine others) be such, as that it outweigh any arguments moving him to the contrary; and such, as the like evidence is thought sufficient to determine us in other Elections. And then, this Church thus being found, he may be resolved by it concerning the sense of other Divine Revelations more dubious, and generally touching all other difficulties to him in Religion: to wit, so far as this Church, from time to time, seeth a necessity of such Resolution, and the Divine Revelation therein is to her sufficiently clear; only if such person, not spending so much of his own Judgment, will afford, in stead of it, a little more of his Obedience. And thus, p. 81.—*In case these Guides* [Persons, or Churches; for, both have a subordination] *shall disagree, yet every Christian may easily know, whose judgments among them he ought to follow: namely always of that Church-authority, that is the Superiour, which in most cases is indisputable; this Ecclesiastical Body being placed by the Divine Providence in an exact Subordination. As here in* England *it is not doubted, whether we are to pay our Obedience rather to a National Synod than to a Diocesan; to the Arch-Bishop, or Primate, than to an ordinary Bishop, or Presbyter: And then, he who hath some experience in Church-affairs, if willing to take such a course, cannot but discerne, what way the major part of Christendome, and its higher and more comprehensive Councils, that have hitherto been, do guide him.* And the more *simple* and *ignorant*, who so can come to know nothing better, ought to follow the example of the more *experienced*. See below Note on p. 251. l. 8 n. 6.

Pag. 178. *l.* (10). *He must think me a very easy man to yield* [a submission of my understanding] *till I be satisfied first, that God hath appointed such to be my Guides: and in the next place, that he hath promised Infallibility to them.* If I am satisfied of the *first*, *that God hath appointed such to be my Guides*, I may safely commit my self to their *guideship* in all things where I want it; *i.e.* in all my uncertainties, without enquiring after the *next*, their *Infallibility*.

Ib. l. (2). *We desire to know whom they mean by these Guides; and at last we understand them to be the Bishop of* Rome, *and his Clergy.* No. They are the universal Clergy, Persons, and Synods, that are set over us by Christ: ranked in a due subordination, in *Persons*, ascending (here in these Occidental Churches) to the *Patriarch* of the *West*; in *Synods*, to a *Patriarchal*, or *General*, Council. And, in any dissension among these, the *Superiour*, Persons, or Synods, are our true Guides.

Pag. 179. *l.* 2. *Here we demurr; and own no authority the Bishop*

Biſhop of Rome *hath over us.* Then we do not what we ought; He being juſtly the *Patriarch* of the *Weſt*, and the *Prime* Patriarch of the *Catholick* Church, and the *Preſident* in *General* Councils.

Ib. l. 4. *We have all the rights of a Patriarchal Church.* I ſuppoſe, He means of a *Primate*—and *Metropolitan* Church; *Primats* having ſomtimes had the title of *Patriarchs*. But theſe rights are ſuch as are ſubordinate to other *higher* Perſons, and Councils: and this of *England* is but one of the Weſtern Provinces, the Biſhops whereof conſtitute a *Patriarchal* Council. And what remedy would there be of ſuppreſſing the Hereſies or Schiſms that may and often have infected ſuch *Provincial* or *National* Churches, if there were no ſuperiour *Church-Authority* above them?

Ib. l. 12. *To theſe* [*viz.* the Biſhops of our own Church] *who are our lawful Guides, we promiſe a due obedience.* But neither are they our lawful Guides, nor our obedience to them due, ſhould any or all of them be Heretical, Schiſmatical, or oppoſing their *Superiours*. In ſuch caſe thoſe, not they, are our *right Guides*.

Ib. l. 15. *For the Biſhop and Clergy of* Rome *we owe none to them.* Nor none is required, ſave to the *Roman Biſhop* as S. *Peter's* Succeſſour, and Supreme Paſtor of the Church, and Patriarch of the Weſt: more, (as to any ſubmiſſion of the *Metropolitan Engliſh*, to the *Metropolitan Roman*, Church, theſe being co-ordinate,) is not deſired.

Ib. l. (7). *We are not to ſubmit to thoſe who are lawful Guides in all things they may require.* Yes, *To ſubmit* to all their Definitions, if they *Supreme*. Yes; though they fallible yet to ſubmit *in all things*, where we not *certain*; ſay learned *Proteſtants*.

Pag. 180. *l.* 9. *So my adverſary* N.O. *in his Preface ſaith*, that by the principles, *we hold, we excuſe and juſtify all Sects which have or ſhall ſeparate from our Church.* *By the Principles we hold*: i.e. by the Dr's and ſome other's *Principles*, the followers of *Chillingworth*. *Excuſe and juſtify Sects.* N.O. ſaith not that you excuſe or juſtify them in every thing, but in this one thing; that every one of them may undertake to be his own Guide in *Neceſſaries* upon ſuch a *Principle* as the Dr's 13th; ſince the ſenſe of Scripture in all *theſe* points is ſaid to be ſo *plain*, as none well endeavouring can miſtake it: and then, for *non-neceſſaries*, what need they ſeek for a *Guide*? * Or; that, Since none owe ſubmiſſion of their judgment to * their *Eccleſiaſtical* Superiours, every one may follow *their own*. Or, that, if you may depart from your Superiours,

periours, Persons, or Councils, upon *just cause*; of which cause you say, it is all reason that you, not your Superiours, judge then, so may they from you upon any *cause* they also think *just*. * Or, that, if there be no *decisive* Judge for differences between *you* and *your Superiours* to whom you can be obliged; so neither is there, for differences between *them* and *you*: * and that, as you appeale from your Ecclesiastical Superiours to Evidence of Scripture, (so seeming to you), in your cause; so may they, from you, in theirs. Exemplified at large in the *Socinian's* Plea, in the *4th Discourse* concerning the *Guide* in *Controversies*. Hence, I say, Sects take liberty in this Church, I think contrary to the intention of the *4th* and *5th* Canon of the *Synod* 1603. to hold and believe what opinions they please, though different from the Church of *England's Articles*, since they think, she cannot justly require an *Assent* from her *Subjects*, which she denies to her *Superiours*. In this thing it is that *N.O.* saith, you seem to justify these *Sects*, that daily fall from you upon such a mistaken *Christian liberty* from Obedience to their Guides: who also observes || that Dr *St's Principles* that appear in the defence of the *Religion* established in the Church of *England*, for any thing he sees, make the same Apology also for all those other Protestant *parties*, and *Sects* disclaimed by it. But *N.O.* is far from saying, that you excuse and justify these Sects in every thing they do, or differ in from you; or that you do not dissent from them in many things, very just on your side, culpable on theirs; which may be granted, and the other thing still be true: *viz.*: that Dr *St's. Principles* make an equal *Apology* for all dividing *Partyes* as to several other their practices. And therefore much of that He saith in the Consequents here to that purpose, seems no way pertinent to *N.O's Observation*.

|| p. 98.

Ib. 1. (12). *We appeale to the doctrine and practice of the truly Catholick Church in the matters of difference between us and the Church of* Rome: *we are as ready as they to stand to the unanimous consent of Fathers, and to* Vincentius Lerinensis *his Rules of Antiquity, Universality and Consent; we declare let the things in dispute be proved to have been the practice of the Christian Church in all Ages, we are ready to submit to them.* 1. First here by *appealing and standing to the doctrine and practice of the Catholick Church* doth He mean submission of his private judgment to the *doctrines* taught by *it?* But, what if the Catholick Church be fallible in such its doctrine (as I think he saith it is; see before §. 7. p. 118. —*When I speak of Infallibility* [i.e. of the Catholick Church] *in fundamentals, I there declare, that I mean no more by it, than that there shall be*

Compare p. 182. l. (7.)

N. 1.

be always a number of true Christians in the world. And Protestants ordinarily affirm, that in *non-necessaries* the *whole* Catholick Church of any age, and consequently the unanimous consent of the *Fathers*, or Primitive times may err; nor will they here allow the Church-Governours of any Age to be the Judges of the *necessity* or non-necessity of the *doctrines* they teach.). I say then, what if the Catholick Church be fallible in such its Doctrine? And next, what if he should be *Certain* of the contrary, as possibly he may? How therefore he can rightly engage thus, I see not. Again; *in this truly Catholick Church*, to whose *doctrine* and *practice* he will submit, doth he include all particular *Christian*, at least *Metropolitan*, Churches, and so his own? (which there is no reason for, if Heretical, or Schismatical Churches be extra-Catholick). And by the *consent* of these *Churches* doth he require an *unanimous* and *universal* consent of them *all*, so that if any, suppose his own, do dissent, he shall be disobliged? But, thus, he makes sure work, and may safely venture his *submission* upon these terms; for, if his own Church be but true to him, or he to himself, he shall not be cast. And an *Arian*, an *Eutychian*, a *Quaker*, any *Heretick* or *Schismatick*, may safely make such an appeal. Again; *by the doctrine of the true Catholick Church* means he the Catholick Church of the *present* age, which is the only now living Judge to be appealed to and to decide any thing concerning *former* times, if question be made about it? Or means he not this, but the Church of *all ages* past, taken together? and next means he, the universal and unanimous consent of this Catholick Church also, *nemine contradicente*? As Bishop *Tailour* also elsewhere ‖ saith, That it is impossible for the Roman Doctours to conclude, from the *sayings* of *Fathers*, their Doctrines to be the *Catholick* doctrin of the *ancient* Church——*Because* (saith he) *any number that is lesse than all doth not prove a Catholick Consent.* If the Dr then mean thus, Here he is as safe or safer from being refuted, than before: and whereas he requires *this consent also to be proved to him*, he that undertakes it would have a fine task. For, it is to be proved *universally* as to *Persons*, *Times*, *Places*, none of any age left out; well suting with *Vincentius* his *Rule*, (which therefore he saith, he is content to follow and stand to)——*Quod ab omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper*, if it is to be so rigidly understood. But, as Dr *Hammond* notes upon this Rule ‖——*That for the universality of Time it must be cautiously understood; not so, as to signify to a prejudice to any doctrine, if in some one or more ages it had not been universally received: for then there could be no heretick at any time in the world.* So must it be observed also for Universality of *Place*; and, of *Consenters*; in that

‖ *Dissuasive* c. 1. p. 7.

‖ *Of Heresy*, §. 5. n. 8.

that these also must be cautiously understood; not so, as to signify it a prejudice to any doctrine, if in some one or more places, or by some persons, or also Churches dissenting it hath not been *universally* received: for else there could be so also no *Hereticks* at any time in the world. This of the just qualifying of *Vincentius* his *Rule*.

N. 2. But here, on the other side will our Author submit to that which is but reasonably proposed; submit his judgment to the Doctrine and Practice of the truly *Catholick Church* in *present* being? since that of former ages after the Apostles is no more infallible, than the present: or, that of any one age, than of another; and since, as to *not failing* in *Necessaries*, the promises of our Lord are made to all Ages *alike*, and General Councils in all ages have *equal* power, one as another, of making Definitions in matters of faith, and inserting them also in the Creeds, if they see fit. And again, in any differences that may be in this present Catholick Church, will he allow a *much major* part hereof to give the law to, and conclude, the *whole* so as it did in the first four General Councils; and, as it is used in all Courts consisting of many; and which thing, unless allowed, no *Heresy* or *Schisme* in the Catholick Church can be suppressed by Its *Judgment*; because all Heresy or Schisme hath a *party*: and the chief and most dangerous Hereticks have been *Bishops*, *Primates*, and also *Patriarchs* (so that the Dr's plea cannot exempt the *Church* of *England* from this trial by his calling
‖ *p.* 179. it a *Patriarchal* Church‖): Or, since it also is controverted, what hath been the Common Doctrine of *former* ages, or of the *Fathers*, will he, for the decision of this, submit to the judgment herein of the much major part of the present Church Catholick, or of Christianity, or of his Canonical Superiours? *i.e.* submit to the most *common reason* of the Church that readeth the Fathers Writings? If he will do this, as in all reason he should, then, as to many of these points in difference between Protestants and the Church of *Rome*, and particularly in these, the so much now decried, *Transubstantiation*, and the necessary consequent of it *Adoration*, and those other points exclaimed against, *Veneration of Images and Relicks*, *Invocation of Saints*, &c; as also in this point what was the *judgment* of *Antiquity* in *these*, whose *doctrine* this major part of the Church declares themselves in these things to follow; I say, in all these, and many others, He will be cast even by the confession of *Protestants*; who also acknowledge their discession at the Reformation to have been made *a toto mundo*; and as well from the *Greek*, as *Latin*, Church: Or, to be short, will he submit to the judgment of a lawful General Council, if it hath determined any

of

of these differences, or of what Councils do appear to have had the acceptation both of the East and West, excepting Protestants? But such *Concessions*, often used by him in *general*, signify nothing: and his true *Plea* seems contrary to it; *viz.* his 13th *Principle*, which is Clearness of Scripture to all persons in all Necessaries: which if granted, what needs, *herein*, the guidance of, and submission to, the *Clergy* either of the past, or present age?

Ib. l. (5). *Let the things in dispute be proved* &c. And who to judge of this proof? your selves? Or Superiour Councils, rather?

Ib. l. (2). *But those who separate from the Church of* England *make* &c. This is nothing to that particular, wherein *N.O.* said the Dr justified Sects: mentioned before in Note on p. 180. l. 9.

Pag. 181. *l.* 12. *We defend the Government of the Church by Bishops to be the most ancient and Apostolical Government, and that no persons can have sufficient reason to cast that off, which hath been so universally received in all Ages since the Apostles times: if there have been disputes among us about the nature of the differences between the two Orders, and the necessity of it in order to the Being of a Church, such there have been in the Church of* Rome *too.* Here, if by *defending the Government of the Church by Bishops to be the most Ancient and Apostolical Government* he means *exclusively* to a Government in other places by a Presbytery without Bishops its being as *ancient* and *Apostolical*, as it; [Whenas (contrary to this) in his *Irenicum* he saith—‖ *That, in all probability, the Apostles did not observe any one fixed course of settling Church-Government, but settled it according to the several, circumstances of time, places, and persons.* And, p. 344.—*That the Apostles did not establish Episcopacy from any unalterable Law of Christ, or from any such indispensable reasons as will equally hold in all times, places, and persons:* and there‖ quotes that incomparable man (as he stiles him) Mr *Hales* in his *Tract* of *Schism* saying—*That Bishops by Christs institution* [I add, or Apostolical Constitution; for, this also would oblige] *have no Superiority over men further, than of Reverence.* And—*making all difference between Church-officers to arise from consent of Parties*: and to the same purpose cites Arch-bishop *Cranmer*;‖ (where perhaps he might have done well to have followed the discretion of the former times, in not thus publishing and exposing the nakedness of this Father of the English Reformation). From all which it follows, that the Government by Bishops as understood contradistinct to, & not the same with, that of Presbyters is no *Constitution Apostolical*: and that, if it arise only from

‖ *par.* 2. *c.* 6.

‖ *c.* 2. *p.* 395, 396.

‖ *p.* 391.

consent of Parties, by consent of Parties also it may be removed.] Again, in what he saith next, *That no persons can have sufficient reason to cast that off, which hath been so universally received in all Ages since the Apostles times*, if he means; No Magistrate, Ecclesiastical, or Civil, hath any lawful power to cast off or change the *Church-Government* by *Bishops*; [whereas he saith the contrary to this in his *Irenicum*; and, from Bishop *Downham*, *Mason*, and some others their allowing a Presbyterial Government only in case of necessity, *viz.* where Bishops cannot be had, argues thus——† *It remains* (saith he), *that the determining of the form of Government is a matter of liberty in the Church; and what is so, may be determined* (i.e. either way) *by lawful authority; and what is so determined by that authority, doth bind men to obedience.* Thus he. *A matter of liberty in the Church*: What, where Bishops may be had, & where is no case of necessity? This follows not: and so the Design of his *Irenicum* is evacuated.] Again; in the next words, *Which hath been so universally received in all ages since the Apostles times*; if he means universally so received for *places*, as well as *times*, [contrary to what he saith in his *Irenicum* p. 322.——*That it is probable that the Apostles did settle the Government in the Church in a Colledge of* Presbyters, *and in a Bishop and Deacons too, according to the diversity of places and variety of circumstances*: And Ibid.——*That the Succession of Rome* [i.e. by Bishops] *is as muddy, as Tiber it self*:——And, *That the line of Succession fails us here, where we most need it*]: Again; If, in his words following concerning the disputes there have been of the necessity of Episcopacy in order to the being of a Church, he holds *Episcopacy* so necessary to the *Church's being*, as that none have any power in any age or time to alter it; and so, if he will join in this matter with the belief of Catholicks in the Council of Trent ||——*Sacrosancta Synodus declarat, præter cæteros Ecclesiasticos gradus, Episcopos, qui in Apostolorum locum successerunt, ad hunc Hierarchicum Ordinem præcipuè pertinere; & positos, sicut idem Apostolus ait, a Spiritu Sancto regere Ecclesiam Dei; eosque Presbyteris superiores esse.* [things not controverted in the Roman Church] *And Ib. Can.* 6.——*Siquis dixerit in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ non esse Hierarchiam Divinâ ordinatione institutam, quæ constat ex Episcopis, Presbyteris, & Ministris, Anathema sit*: I say, if such be his *meaning* here, I have no more to do, but congratulate with him the correction of his former errour. But, in these expressions, he may mean only, what well consists with his *Irenicum*; that, as the *Government* by *Bishops* is most Ancient and Apostolical in *some* places, so the *Presbyterial* was in *some others*. And——That no persons can have sufficient reason

† part. 2. c. 8. Conclusion.

|| Sess. 23. c. 4.

reaſon to caſt off this Epiſcopal Government in ſuch places where it hath been ſettled, unleſs the *Supreme Majeſtrate* from ſome neceſſary circumſtances think fit to alter it, (as the *Apoſtles*, he ſaith, in ſome places ſettled a *Presbytery* in ſtead of it): I ſay, he may have ſuch a meaning. And, if his former opinion be changed herein, perhaps he might have done well to have publiſhed his preſent contrary *judgment* more fully and clearly, to make an amends for his formerly publiſhed *miſtakes*. Which elſe, when a future opportunity may ſerve, and power aſſiſt the inclinations of contrary Sects, may miniſter arguments afreſh for the *Lawfulneſs* of their Abrogating the *Epiſcopal* Government, and introducing *their own*. And he may ſee what uſe the *Replyer* to *Durel*|| hath made of them already in Defence of *Presbyterianiſm* againſt *Epiſcopacy*. || *Patronus bonæ fidei.*

Ib. l. (8). *We appeal and are ready to ſtand to the judgment of the Primitive Church for interpreting the letter of Scripture in any difference between us and the Church of Rome.* See before Note on p. 180. l. (12.)

Ib. l (4). *But thoſe who ſeparate from our Church will allow nothing to be lawful* [in the worſhip of God] *but what hath an expreſs command in Scripture.* See the former Diſc. §. 88. Theſe *Separatiſts* ground this their tenent upon *Scriptures*, as they think, *clear*: ſome of whom at leaſt are ſuppoſed to have uſed their beſt endeavour rightly to underſtand them; the ſenſe alſo they take theſe Scriptures in being very contrary to their *intereſt*; and having brought great *ſufferings* upon them. The point ſeems very *neceſſary* to be clear to them in Scriptures both for the right ſervice of God, and for the peace of the Church. Muſt not therefore our Author here either relinquiſh his 13th *Principle*, or ſay, the Texts are indeed clear on the *Separatiſts* ſide: or that none knows when he uſeth his *beſt endeavours*; and ſo neither knows when he miſtakes plain Scriptures? As for the modern Sectariſts their appealing to the Primitive Church in the differences between them and *that of England*, as the *Church* of *England*, he ſaith, doth in her differences with *Rome*, See *Patronus bonæ fidei in Cauſa Puritanorum*, in his *Prodromus* p. 88. 89. where alſo he cites as on his ſide *contra Hierarchicos abeuntes a primævâ praxis Dr* Stillingfleet's *Irenicum* p. 66. 67. 68. See alſo in *fidei Patrono*. p. 4. 5.

Pag. 182. *l.* 2. *Which* [infallibility] *thoſe of the Church of* Rome *do challenge.* They plead only the Infallibility of the Church Catholick, whoſe Subjects they are, in her General Councils. Neither is there one word in the *Principles Conſidered* concerning the Infallibility of the *Church* of *Rome*, with which yet the Dr ſo often relieves himſelf.

Ib. l. 16. *To talk of Accommodation is folly, and to design it madness.* Viz. againſt the *Determinations* of a *lawful General* Council; or alſo a *Patriarchal*, by any Eccleſiaſtical Body inferiour and ſubordinate to it. What terms of Compoſition can an *Arian* expect after the *Council* of *Nice*?

Ib. l. (7). *But there is no ſuch thing in the leaſt pretended by our Church, that declares in her Articles, That General Councils may err——and that all the proof of things to be believed is to be taken from Holy Scripture.* And not from *Church*, or *Councils*, declaring to us the *ſenſe* of Scripture, becauſe they fallible herein: then no proof in any matter of faith is admitted from *Primitive* times, or *conſent* of *Fathers*, which He but now appealed to. See Note on p. 180. l. (12).

Pag. 183. *l.* 2. *And none of them charge our Church with any errour in doctrine; nor plead that as the reaſon of their ſeparation.*

‖ See Reaſons ſhewing the neceſſity of Reformation of the Publick Doctrine, &c. 1660. p. 5, 6.

What then means the Presbyterian Miniſters complaint ‖ for the Church of *Englands* impoſing upon them things in the *Common Prayer Book* and 39. *Articles* repugnant to *Scripture*; and, requiring their aſſent to them; citing the 4. 5. and 36. *Canon* of the *Synod* 1603. and 13. *Eliz.* 12.? And do they not hold this an *erroneous* doctrine, but now named by Him, p. 181.——*That ſomthing may be lawful to be uſed in the worſhip of God, beſides what he hath expreſly commanded?* And ſee the forecited Author *in Bon. Fid. Part.* p. 4. requiting of *Durell*——*Ut purgaret Hierarchicos a Crimine corruptæ doctrinæ Anglicanæ, & commutatæ in Arminianiſmum, & Papiſmum in multis.*

Ibid. l. 6. *The Church of* Rome *not only requires the belief of her errours, which is plaine by the often objected Creed of* Pius, &c. *But makes the belief of them neceſſary to ſalvation.*; If in the *Profeſſion* required by *Pius* no diſtinction is made between the *Definitions* of former *Councils* and other common *Articles* of the *Creed*, ſo neither is there in the *Athanaſian* Creed between the ſaid Definitions and former Articles of the *Apoſtle's* Creed. As for making the belief of them neceſſary to ſalvation, *N. O.* hath already anſwered *Conſid.* p. 77.——*That none are obliged to ſuch a neceſſary belief of them, as that a perſon neſcient of them cannot be ſaved*; *or, that the explicite knowledge of them is* abſolutely *neceſſary*, (*though always in ſome manner beneficial it is*) *to ſalvation: but that this indeed is neceſſary to ſalvation, that any ſubject of the Church, when knowing them to be determined by her, obey her definitions, and not reject or diſſent from them: Such diſobedience being conceived a mortall breach of Gods command.*

Ib. l. (11). *But nothing of this nature can be objected againſt*

gainſt our Church by diſſenters. But, this is objected by them, that *Aſſent* is required to the *Common Prayer Book* and 39. *Articles*, as containing in them nothing erroneous or repugnant to *Scripture*, upon Excommunication, if any one affirm it, till ſuch perſon repents of ſuch his wicked errour; and without any qualification that ſuch aſſent be yielded only *as far as the ſame Articles are agreeable to Gods Word.* Here then I ask, Whether ſuch a wicked errour, and herein ſuch an obſtinate diſobedience to ones lawful Spiritual Superiours, and continuance out of their communion, unrepented-of, is not held by the Church of *England* to *exclude ſuch perſon from being a member* of Chriſts Body, and from Salvation? Which Church declares *Art.* 33. concerning a juſt excommunication——*That the perſon which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen, and a Publican, until he be openly reconciled by Penance; and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.* Of which matter thus alſo *Calvin* ||——*Negnis tale Eccleſiæ judicium ſpernat; aut parvi æſtimet ſe fidelium ſuffragiis damnatum, teſtatus eſt Dominus iſtud ipſum nihil aliud eſſe quàm ſententiæ ſuæ promulgationem; ratumque haberi in cœlis, quod illi in terrâ egerint.* and §. 10.——*Qui Eccleſiæ cenſurâ* [ſpeaking of a juſt Excommunication by a Church Reformed] *excommunicantur ſuæ etiam ipſorum perpetuæ damnationis, niſi reſipuerint, certi ſiunt.* || *Inſtit.* 4. c. 12. §. 4.

Ib. l. (4). *That it was neceſſary to ſalvation to be in ſubjection to the Biſhop of* Rome. The words in the *Lateran* Council under *Leo* are theſe——*In Eccleſiâ eſſe non poteſt, qui Romani Pontificis Cathedram deſerit.* It is neceſſary to ſalvation that one be in the *Church Catholick*, be no *Heretick* or *Schiſmatick*, but yield obedience to his lawful Eccleſiaſtical Superiours; the Supreme amongſt whom is the Biſhop of *Rome*; the Succeſſour of S. *Peter* in the Prime *Apoſtolick See*, who alſo preſides in and confirms lawful General Councils; So that Obedience to all lawful General Councils in this ſenſe involveth alſo obedience to him, their *Preſident*.

Pag. 184. *l.* 1. *The Guides of the Roman Church pretend to as immediate authority of obliging the conſciences of men, as Chriſt or his Apoſtles had.* Means he not here requiring *Aſſent* to their *Decrees* upon *Anathema?* But let him then urge this againſt lawful *General Councils*, which have practiſed it, and declared ſuch matters to oblige mens *conſciences* to obedience, as being *Gods Word.* But, if he means here, that the *Roman* Church pretends ſuch an immediate authority in obliging mens conſciences as to her Injunctions or Conſtitutions in matters *indifferent*, and no way

way commanded by God; *i.e.* as if she enjoined their obedience also to them as to things necessary and commanded by God, this is utterly denied, and makes the Church contradict her self; for, if they are commanded by God, how are they enjoined as things indifferent? But the Church affirms, men are bound in *conscience* to obey these, not because they are divine Commands, but only because the Persons are obliged by the *Divine Command* (which binds the *Conscience*) to obey the Church's *Command* in all such matters. Necessary such things are to be observed because the Church commands them; and men also bound in conscience to observe them, because they are commanded by God to obey such Commands of the Church. And this *obligation* of *Conscience* I think the *Dr* admits as well as *Catholicks*, See his *Irenicum* c. 2. p. 65. where he saith that——*What is left undetermined by the Divine Law, if it be determined by lawful Authority in the Church of God doth bind the Consciences of those, who are subject to such authority, to obedience to those determinations*: and cites for it *Rom.* 13. 5. *that we are to be subject to these* Governours *for Conscience sake.* The Church may pretend to any authority our Lord or his Apostles have given it, without dishonouring, or degrading, or equalling themselves to the Donor. He goes on.

Ib. l. 6. *But our Guides challenge no more than teaching men to do what Christ had commanded them; and in other things not commanded or forbidden, to give rules, which on the account of the General Commands of Scripture they look on the members of our Church as obliged to observe. Obliged to observe:* I hope he means, as obeying here a just authority; [and not as he explains himself in his || *Irenicum* || ——*Thus far I acknowlege a binding power in Ecclesiastical Constitutions, that though they neither bind by vertue of the matter, nor of the authority commanding (there being no legislative power lodged in the Church) yet, in respect of the circumstances and the end, they should be obeyed, unless I judge the thing unlawful that is commanded, rather than manifest open contempt of the Pastors of the Church, or bring a scandal to others*]. And here, when the Church of *England* thus obligeth her subjects to the practice of such things as she holds indifferent, (unless she makes this a condition of her obligation, *if they* first hold them lawful), she obligeth them also to hold such things lawful; since none may practise any thing apprehended by his conscience to be unlawful. Lastly; as the Church of *England* hath *authority to give Rules in things neither commanded nor forbidden* by God; so, I ask, Hath she no authority in *Controversies* of *Faith*, for the deciding them? See *Art.* 29th. *of the Church of England.*

|| *cha.* 2. §. 7. § 46.

Ib.

Ib. l. 17. *In the Church of* Rome *it is accounted as much a mortall ſin to diſobey their Guides in the moſt indifferent things as to diſobey God in the plain commands of Scripture. As much?* No. But, *as well:* for *Mortal* Sins admit degrees. And——*Mandata Eccleſiaſtica non anteponi, ſed poſtponi debere dicimus Divinis Præceptis:* || ſaith the Cardinal; Though all diſobeying our *Superiours* in lawful things is alſo diſobeying *God*, when He, in ſuch, commanding obedience to them. Again, *As well* a Mortal Sin, in *ſome* diſobedience of theſe Governours, but not in *all*; not in things of no great conſequence, in reſpect of the benefit or damage that is received by, the doing or omitting, them. And laſtly theſe things are extended as well to the *Laws* of *Civil*, as *Eccleſiaſtical*, Governours. So that, if the Catholicks ſeem to apply ſome Conſcientiall obedience to the *Eccleſiaſtical* Judge, diſliked and denyed to him by Proteſtants, ſo do they alſo, to the *Civil*.

|| *Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l.* 4. *c.* 17.

Ib. l. (10). *They challenge likewiſe to themſelves a power to diſpenſe with the laws of God, as in matter of Mariages.* The Church only diſpenſeth where antecedently no *Divine Law*, but only a *Church-law*, obligeth: thoſe about *Marriages* being, many of them, *Levitical Judicial* Laws, obligatory only to the ancient Commomwealth of the *Jews*, and not now to *Chriſtians*, But, *in impedimentis juris Divino naturali conjugium dirimentibus*, the Church pretends no *diſpenſative* power.

Ib. l. (8). *And with the Inſtitution of Chriſt, as in Communion in one kind.* See this ſpoken to before in Note on p. 151. l. 6.

Ib. l. (5). *As in the five Sacraments they have added to the two of Chriſt.* As the *Roman* Church reckons *Seven Sacraments*, ſo the *Greek*, [*Sacramenta verò rituſque in hâc ipſâ Catholicâ rectè ſentientium Chriſtianorum Eccleſiâ ſunt Septem*, ſaith *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* againſt the *Lutherans* ||]: and ſo the Catholick Church, before *Luther* appeared. And this Author cannot be ignorant, that Proteſtants alſo, ſince that time, as the Word *Sacrament* is taken in a more general ſenſe, have willingly admitted more than *two*; and acknowledged this conformable to the language of *Antiquity*. And, in the ſhort Engliſh Catechiſme, the Anſwer, (to the Queſtion. How many Sacraments?) *Two only*, is made, as Biſhop *Mountague* obſerves || with this Limitation, *as generally neceſſary to ſalvation*. And on, the other ſide, the Counſil of *Trent* † pronounces *Anathema* to thoſe, who ſhall make them all of an *equal dignity*. And *Baptiſme* and the *Euchariſt* ſhall have the preeminency that Proteſtants deſire.

|| *Reſp. l.* 5. *c.* 7.

|| *Appeal. c.* 33.

† *Seſſ.* 7. *c.* 3.

Ib. l. (2). *Setting aſide theſe conſiderations, we dare appeal,*

&c.

&c. For the *extravagancy* of the next page, I referr the Reader to the *Note* on p. 180. l. 9.

Pag. 185. *l.* 6. *Whether our Church's Impoſing of three Ceremonies, declared to be indifferent by thoſe who required them,* But, *denied* to be ſo by thoſe they are impoſed-on, who therefore complain of tyranny and of forcing the Conſcience; the enjoining the practice of them involving an aſſent alſo that they are lawful; which they that cannot yield muſt ſin, if they practiſe them. And in ſuch a caſe who muſt decide this matter between theſe two? I find him in his *Irenicum* c. 2. p. 63. nominating for this Judge the ſenſe of the *Primitive Church* in the firſt four Centuries and the judgment of the other *Reformed* Churches. There he propoſeth--- *That nothing be required nor determined* [by Church-Governours] *but what is ſufficiently known to be indifferent in its own nature. The only difficulty* (ſaith he) *is how a thing may be ſufficiently known to be indifferent, becauſe one man looks upon that as indifferent which another doth not. The moſt equal way to decide this Controverſy is to make choice of ſuch Judges as are not intereſted in the quarrel, and thoſe are the ſenſe of the* Primitive Church *in the firſt four Centuries who were beſt able to judge, whether they looked upon themſelves as bound by any Command of Scripture, or no: and withal the judgment of the* Reformed *Churches. So that, what ſhal be made appear to be left indifferent by both the ſenſe of the* Primitive *Church, and the Churches of the* Reformation, *may be a matter determinable by Law and which all may be required to conform in Obedience to. But here,* 1ſt. What if when this Judge, *the ſenſe of the Primitive Church,* is admitted by both parties yet there happen diſpute, What, or on which ſide this ſenſe is? Is it not ſo diſputed? and will not the deciding of this need another Judge? 2ly. For the Judgment of the *Reformed* Churches (I ſuppoſe, he means thoſe abroad concerning the Controverſies about *Indifferents* here in *England*) they no way ſeem ſuch as he here ſuppoſeth; i.e. *perſons not intereſted in the quarrel,* ſome of them as to theſe things intertaining the opinion of the *Prelaticks*, others of the *Presbyterian* party. But, were it not ſo, their judgment being fallible, It is contrary I think to this Author's Principles for others to be enjoined or conſtrained to conform to them; either in their practice, where their judgment reluctſ; or in their judgment, where their's alſo may err. 3ly. The Judge in Eccleſiaſtical matters is not left to any ones arbitrary nomination, but is alwaies the *Superiour* Prelates or Councils in reſpect of all others *ſubordinate* to them.

He goes on, *Can be thought---ſo great a Burden to their Conſciences, as all the Load of ſuperſtitious fopperies in the Roman Church.*

Church. Supposing here, not granting, the *Roman* Ceremonies such, (yet some of which at least I hope this Author will protect, because borrowed from her by the Reformed *Church of England*, to the great grief of these *Sects*;) I ask to what end is it here to compare the *Degrees* of Burdens imposed, where the *Least*, if imposed against conscience, is *unsupportable*?

Ib. l. 17. *Whether Transubstantiation, Image-worship, &c. be not somwhat harder things to swallow.* Some of these at least, how hard soever they seem to you, are the *Definitions* either of the *Supreme* Councils, or those *Superiour* to a Provincial or National one of *England*. And to these Councils therefore you owe obedience either of *assent*, or *silence*; and cannot separate from their Communion without *Schisme*.

Ib. l. (11). *Be not somwhat harder things to swallow than the Church's power to appoint matters of Order and decency.* Is then the *appointing matters* of *Order* and *Decency* all the power the Church of *England* doth, or may, assume? I mean; hath this Church no power in Matters, and Controversies, of *Faith*?

Pag. 186. *l.* 1. *Not for any difficulty objected by N.O.* Which, whatever it is, is omitted here by the Dr. See Note on p. 180. l. 9.

Annotations on §. 11. *Of the means to attain the sense of Scripture without an infallible Guide.*

Pag. 186. *l.* 11. *That is the second main Principle in N.O. that without this infallible assistance of the Guides of the Church there can be no certainty of the sense of Scripture.* There are no such words in *N.O.* *N.O.* denies a sufficient certainty of the sense of Scripture in *several* points of necessary faith, ‖ but not in *all*, especially as to some persons and capacities, without the Church's exposition of them. ‖ *See the former Discourse, §.* 2.

Ib. l. 17. *He yields that the Church's infallibility is not necessary to the foundation of faith; for mens faith, he saith, may begin at the infallible authority of Scriptures.* No such words are in *N.O.* neither doth he call that a *Foundation* of Faith, where Faith *begins*. Which Faith begins at that particular *Article* there of which is *first* taught to any by their Instructer, Parents, or Pastor; and this happens to be sometimes one Article, sometimes another: *N.O's* words there † are—*As all Articles of Faith are not by all persons learnt at once, so neither by all exactly in the same*

order, as frequently observed by Catholick Writers. A Christians faith therefore may begin (i.e. in the order of his learning it) either at the infallible authority of Scriptures, or of the Church; and this infallible authority of either of these be learnt from Tradition; and that of the other from it. Thus *N.O.* Concerning the Foundation of Faith I referr the Reader to the former *Note* on p. 84. l. ult.

Ib. l. (3). *He often pleads for necessity of an external infallible Guide; because God hath referred all in the dubious sense of Scripture to the direction of his Ministers, their Spiritual Guides.*

This is by *N.O.* given for the reason of another thing; not *infallibility*; where *N.O.* in answer to the Dr's 18th *Principle* ‖ p. 46. saith in the immediate words preceding ‖——Neither can such Promise (viz. *that whosoeuseth his best endeavour for understanding Scripture,* [if meant exclusively to his consulting and examining the Exposition of the Church] *either shall not err, or not be damned for it*) be pretended necessary, since God hath referred all men &c. And here the Dr omits the vindicating of his *Principle* and applyes *N.O.'s* words to the proving of Infallibility.

Pag. 187. *l.* (9). *Whilst the Scriptures are ambiguous,* &c. *N.O.'s* words are——*whilst the Scriptures in such points,* (*at least to persons unlearned, or of weaker judgments, which are the greatest part of Christians*) *are ambiguous,* which words are here left out by our Author.

Ib. l. (6). *The force of all which comes to this; that we can arrive at no certainty of the sense of Scripture in controverted places without an external infallible Guide: and therefore we are bound to submit to him.* Nay: comes to this: that persons unlearned and of weaker judgments can arrive to no certainty of the sense of Scripture, in *some* matters of *necessary* faith, without an external Infallible Guide; and therefore such a *Guide* is *necessary.*

Pag. 188. *l.* 1. *Point to be Discussed. What necessity there is for the Salvation of persons to have an infallible interpretation of controverted places of Scripture?* *Salvation of persons:* he should add, persons *unlearned,* and of *weaker capacitie,* and doubting of the sense of such places. *Of controverted places of Scripture,* He should add, in points *necessary,* of which *N.O.* every where speaks: (see his words but now quoted by himself) whose Words one would think, but that the Dr surely is a man of more integrity, that he on purpose, to make his Answers more plausible almost every where, as to *both* these, omitteth. Now, the necessity of such an infallible interpretation is this, that *such* person may not err in such *Necessaries.*

Ib. l. 8. *Men may attain a certain sense without an infalli-*

ble

ble Guide. Here again want words. *Men*, all men, the unlearned, thoſe of weakeſt judgment, employed in a ſecular vocation &c. *attain to a certain ſenſe*, in all places of Scripture concerning Neceſſaries.

Ib. l. 13 1ſt. *We are to enquire into the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible interpretation of doubtful places of Scripture.* Add, in *neceſſaries.*

Pag. 189. *l.* 1. *N.O. Muſt prove, not that there are doubtful and controverted places, which no one denies, but that the ſenſe of Scripture is ſo doubtful and obſcure in the things which are neceſſary to mens ſalvation, that perſons without an infallible Guide cannot know the meaning of them.* N. 1. Why it lies more upon *N.O.* to prove, that the ſenſe of Scripture is not clear as to *ſome* perſons, in *ſome* points neceſſary, than on the Dr to prove, that the Scriptnre is clear to them in *all* points neceſſary, I ſee not: ſince he *affirms* theſe plain to all, *N.O.* denies it, and Affirmers, as he ſaith || ought to prove. Here what thinks He of ſeveral of || *p.* 193. the points of the *Athanaſian* Creed urged by *N.O* much controverted in Antiquity, and by the firſt Councils inſerted in this *Creed* as thought neceſſary for mens ſalvation to be known? Are the Scriptures ſo clear in *all* theſe, as *all capacities*, uſing an endeavour ſutable to their vocations, cannot *miſtake* in them? Then what thinks he of his own words *Ration. Account* p. 58. urged by *N.O.* p. 63. and cited before in Note on p. 126. l. 2. *The Deity of Chriſt.* and *the Trinity*, are they not points neceſſary to be rightly believed for attaining Salvation? And Doth not the guidance of the Church-Governours *ſet over* the Church by *God* Eph. 4. 11. 13. relate to Neceſſaries? Or, where the erring of the *unlearned* (which always many Chriſtians muſt be 2. *Pet.* 3. 16.) tends to mens *deſtruction*, is not the *knowing* of the right ſenſe *neceſſary* to their *ſalvation?* What thinks he of the ſenſe of *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, urged by *N.O.* p. 20? Is it clear on the *Proteſtants* ſide to all uſing a juſt endeavour, when the much major part of Chriſtianity, (and, before *Luther's* time, the *whole*,) underſtands it in the *contrary?* And, if *none* of this world of men hath uſed a *right* endeavour, how ſhall any be ſecure of ſuch a right endeavour uſed by him that he may be confident in ſuch clear Scripture he is not deceived? Or, is the true ſenſe of this Text not neceſſary to be known, where ſuch a groſs *Idolatry* is affirmed by our Author to be the neceſſary conſequent of an *erroneous* ſenſe?

But, if he will reſtrain Neceſſaries to the *Apoſtles Creed*, or perhaps only to three or four principal Articles thereof, the pure neſcience of which excludes from ſalvation; then, as he con-

tends these are clear in Scripture, so why will he not allow, that *General Councils* are in these *infallible*, and so the Church in *Necessaries* an Infallible Guide?

But then let him consider, in any such restraint of *necessaries*, yet whether there are not many other points at least so highly *beneficial* to salvation, as that the *Divine Providence* is engaged to leave the *truth* of them also either clear to all sober enquirers in *Scripture*, or to *Guides*, that shall not err in expounding such Scriptures to the people. Indeed, after so much clamour against the pernicious doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, our Author seems to have a hard task of it, and also very unsutable to so much choler, to maintain that none of the points agitated between it, and Protestants is so necessary, (for attaining salvation at least with less difficulty), to be believed on the *Protestant* side, that God should either leave *Scripture* for it clear enough to the sober enquirer; or else, in the sense of Scripture *doubtful*, some living *Guide* unerrably to determine it. Or, if he shall say, God hath left *Scriptures clear* to all capacities well-endeavouring in *all such* points; he seems to have as hard a task again to maintain this; when the major part of Christianity, reading these Scriptures, do think, against him, the contrary to be clear in them. But lastly; if what He over-lavisheth in the *plainness* of *Scripture* to all well-endeavouring capacities and conditions, he will make an amends for now in the *restraining* of *Necessaries*; On whose Judgment, I pray, is it fit a particular person should rely in this Question, which seems of great concernment, *What* or *how many* points are to be called *Necessary*? On Mr *Chillingworth's* or the *Dr's*? Or on that of the Supreme *Guides* of the *Church* assembled in her General Councils, who from time to time declare to Christians by their Decrees, as the *Apostles* did in the first *General Council*, Act. 15. what is Necessary for them to believe, what to practise, against all such *erroneous* Tenents as shall arise in the *Church*, that may any way pervert their *Faith*, or *Manners*?

Ib. l. (7). *If a person then by reading and considering those things which are plain may do what Christ requires* [all that which Christ requires] *for his salvation; what necessity hath such a one to trouble himself about an infallible Guide?* [I add, or Any Guide at all, as to those?.] *For either he may go to heaven without him* [without having any such Guide; fallible or infallible,] *or not? If he may, let him* [the Dr] *shew the necessity such Guide is of to that end, which may be attained without him; if not, then the things necessary to salvation cannot be known without him:* [as the Dr saith before, they may by ones reading and considering those things which are

plain,

plain, and doing all thoſe things Chriſt reqnires for his ſalvation]. So eaſily may his arguing againſt an infallible, ſerve as well againſt any, Guide at all. Meanwhile *N.O.* affirms ſome Perſons cannot Know all Neceſſarics without a Judge.

Pag. 190. *l.* 12. *But doth S.* Peter *ſay* [2. Epiſt c. 3. 16.] *that the Scriptures are ſo hard to be underſtood, that ſober and devout minds cannot learn therein what is neceſſary to their ſalvation?* Yes: if the ſober and devout be *unlearned*, as they may be. *Cannot learn therein* [all] *that is neceſſary*; for ſurely, where the erring therein works their deſtruction, the right ſenſe is neceſſary for their ſalvation.

Ib. l. (11). *Which men that wanted judgment, were ready to pervert to their own miſchief*, &c. As ſome may want, that are *ſober, devout, and diligent*; and which want of Judgment, as to ſome, no care or diligence can remove.

Ib. l. (9). *But if there be ſuch difficulties* [in S. *Paul's* Epiſtles,] *is there nothing plain and eaſy?* Yes: many things. But, if many things plain and eaſy, are there no ſuch difficulties?

Ib. l. (7). *If bad men may pervert them, may not good men make a good uſe of them?* And, if learned men make *good uſe* of them, may not yet the unlearned *miſtake* them? Or, muſt all theſe get learning, that they may not?

Pag. 191. *l.* 15. *If on ſo fair and juſt an occaſion offered, S.* Peter *himſelf, whom they believe to have been Head of the Church at that time, and at* Rome *at the writing of this Epiſtle, doth wholly omit referring men in the ſenſe of obſcure places to infallible Guides, what can we elſe inferr, but that S.* Peter *thought no ſuch thing of neceſſity for his Church?* A Negative argument is often invalid. Every thing is not every where ſaid. If we find not in S. *Peter*, 'tis ſufficient if in S. *Paul*.——*Whoſe Faith* follow ||. And——*The Church* [i.e. in its Governours] *is the Pillar and Ground of Truth.* But we read in S. *Peter* ſuch things as theſe——That they ſhould *ſubmit themſelves to their Presbyters*, ſuch Presbyters as he was, *that fed the flock of God*, i.e. with their doctrine; and ſo, that they ſhould ſubmit to *It. 1. Pet.* 5. 5. compared with 1, 2.——We read in him 2. 10, 15. That God will ſurely puniſh thoſe that are *ſelf-willed and deſpiſe Government, and ſpeak evil of Dignities*, which I apply in the firſt place to *Spiritual* Governours and *Eccleſiaſtical* Dignities. And chap. 3. 2. that he writ his ſecond *Epiſtle* to them, *that they might be mindful of the Commandements of them the Apoſtles of our Lord and Saviour.* [and ſo, of their Succeſſours]. And here, in the next verſe after theſe unſtable wreſters, we find S. *Peter* adviſing them to take heed of *being led away with the error*

|| *Heb.* 13. 7. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15.

of;

of theſe wicked ones, and *of falling from their ſtedfaſtneſs*] i.e. in their adhering conſtantly to the doctrine learnt from their Spiritual Superiours].

N. 2. Here then the Reader hath an account from the Dr, (how right let him judge), of the place in S. *Peter* urged by *N.O*; but what anſwer returns he to *Eph.* 4. 11, 13, 14. and to the reſt mentioned before in *Note on* p. 189. l. 1. that are cited by *N.O.*? and what to *his own* words, to make *himſelf* at leaſt agree with himſelf? I find none. I find him often delivering the ſtate of the Queſtion between him and his adverſary in indefinite, and ſo ambiguous, propoſitions: and then dividing of his diſcourſe upon it into ſeveral heads, each copiouſly proſecuted. But, meanwhile, *N.O's Conſiderations* unconſidered ſlip through his fingers; and, out of the *memory* alſo of any, ſave a very watchful, *Reader*, thus amuſed with other things.

Annotations on his §. 12. *Of the Neceſſity of a* Judge *in* Controverſies.

Pag. 192. *l.* 2. *Is it that without this* [an infallible determination of doubtful places in neceſſaries] *the Church's peace cannot be preſerved?* Add; nor an *Unity* of *Faith*, which is requiſite in *Neceſſaries*, Eph. 4. 5, 11, 13. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm* [into this Faith].

Ib. l. 6. *Unleſs there be an infallible Judge to determine which is the true ſenſe of Scripture.* He ſhould ſay, in Neceſſaries. But, then, his following Anſwer would not ſute with the Queſtion.

Ib. l. 16. *The ſtrength of this argument depends upon the ſuppoſition of the neceſſity of determining controverſies.* Add, neceſſary to be determined, becauſe in *Neceſſaries*.

Ib. l. (8). *The weakneſs of humane underſtanding, the power of intereſt and paſſion, and the ambiguity of words are as apt to beget diſputes in Religion, as in any other thing.* More need ſtill of *deciding* ſome of theſe diſputes; ſince ſo many things, even in the moſt *neceſſary* Credends, beget them.

Pag. 193. *l.* 8. *This Queſtion is plainly about a matter of fact*; i.e *whether Chriſt hath appointed ſuch judges in all ages, who are to determine all emergent controverſies about the difficult places of his Law?* Here, doth not He *queſtion* Whether the ſitting and authority of lawful General Councils, is held from *Chriſt* or by

by his *appointment*? By what *authority* these Supreme Ecclesiastical Courts make their Definitions and Decrees? Upon what ground Christianity appeals to them? This is the influence and fruit of his 13*th*. *Principle*. But, if he *allows* here these Supreme Judges to hold their *Authority* and *Commission* from Christ *for determining all emergent Controversies about the difficult places of his Law*; But denies their *infallibility* as to all *necessaries*, (to which *N.O.* confines it), then I would know whether they are constituted such Judges, as that their *sentence* is to be *obeyed* in these matters: (and why else are they Judges)? If to be obeyed; then either they must be *infallible* in all *necessary* controversies; or else the people after, as before, their judgment are still in *these* liable to *errour*. Suppose in the Controversy of the *Arians*, or *Socinians*, about the *Deity* of our *Saviour*.

Ib. l. 13. *And in this case we think, it is all the reason in the world, that they who affirm should prove.* May not I here return the *proving* upon himself, That *Experience* shews there is a *Necessity* of such an Infallible Guide, since *God* is not wanting to his Church in *Necessaries*; and since the *Scriptures* are not so *cleare* in all necessary points, as to prevent all doubters and disputers; and those, that say they are *clear*, let them prove it: for, *they, that affirm, must prove?* But, both for the *Commission* and *Infallibility* of such Guides see before Note on p. 113. l. 17.

Pag. 194. *l.* 2. *What if Christ, having provided for the necessaries of salvation by a clear revelation, should leave other things in the dark, to exercise the wits of some, and the charity of others?*

Hath not his 13th *Principle* here unhappily engaged him to maintain with Mr *Chillingw.* that, since all necessaries are clear in Scripture, all *Controversies* in religion are about *non-necessaries*; and so no necessity of a *Judge* to determine them? Can we think then, that it is not very necessary, that any of the *Controversies* that are between *Protestants* & the *Church* of *Rome* about *Merit of Works*, *Praying for the Dead, and Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, *Adoration of the Eucharist*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Worship of Images*, in which is said to be *Idolatry* on the *Roman* part, *&c.* were decided? Had the former *Decisions* touching such matters, of these Judges in Controversies of Religion gone on the *Protestant* side, surely, we had not had so many *What if's* for the *non-necessity* of them.

Ib. l. 11. *What if Christ foresaw this matter of ending controversies* [i.e. by a living Judge] *would be an occasion of raising one of the greatest*, &c. Doth not this grate upon *General Councils?* Apply this to the Definitions of the *Athanasian* Creed, and see what thanks these *Fathers* that composed it have returned

to

to them for ſo ſettling the Chriſtian Faith; and not rather *leaving ſuch things in the dark to exerciſe mens wits, and their charity one to another; and obliging them to their own greater honeſty and integrity in knowing and doing God's will.* Are there not then too many Controverſies yet on foot, for the ſerving all theſe *ends*? And may not the *Sects* that have departed from the Church of *England* make good uſe of the Dr's *What ifs*, in reſpect of the things the *Church* of *England* requires from them? Whom *what if* our Lord hath left in all ſuch things to their *Chriſtian Liberty*?

Ib. l. 16. *What if Chriſt thought it reaſonable to leave the failings of mens underſtandings and lives upon the ſame terms; ſo, as to give ſufficient means to prevent either, but not effectually to hinder men from falling into either of them?* Chriſt hath left both theſe here on the ſame *terms*; *i.e.* hath left an *Infallible* Guide for *Manners*, as well as *Faith*: but ſo, as we may poſſibly ſwerve from him in either. He may be pleaſed to review the *Conſideration* on his 30th *Principle* p. 82. where it is ſaid——*That God hath provided by the ſame Church-Authority to preſerve his Church in Truth, and to reſtrain it from Sin; giving an equal Commiſſion to teach the Ignorant, and to correct the Vicious. And that, ſince their Doctrine directs our Manners, as well as Faith; their Infallibility is as neceſſary for things of practice, as of Speculation. That, Errour in opinion alſo may be ſuch, as may be much more dangerous to us, than for the preſent a vicious life, ſuppoſing our perſiſtence in a right Faith: becauſe we have our Conſcience ſtill left uncorrupted to reclaim us in the latter, but not ſo in the former; And there is more hope of his recovery, who as yet doth ill with a reluctting judgment. That ſome erroneous opinions or other alſo are the ordinary ſources and ſprings of evil practices; and that the Dr cannot but acknowledge this, who hath ſpent a conſiderable part of the Book to which he hath annexed his* Principles, *upon pretending to ſhew, how* Roman *errours do induce an evil life, and deſtroy devotion.* This of the ſpecial need of ſuch a Guide for *the failing of mens underſtandings.*

Ib. l. (9). *What if the nature of Religion will not bear ſuch a determination of controverſies as Civil matters will? becauſe civil matters concern the right and wrong of particular perſons, in which it is not the ſentence of the Judge ſo much as the civil force whereby it is backed which puts an end to the diſpute; but, in matters of Religion, the ending controverſies can be no effect of force and power, but of Reaſon and conviction of conſcience.* Doth not He argue here, that an Infallible Guide or Judge ſutes not with the nature of Religion, becauſe ending Controverſies can be no effect of *force* and *power*, but of *reaſon* and *conviction* of conſcience? But how then

did

did the Infallibility of our Lords Apoſtles, and their *Laws*, their ending the Controverſy about the *Moſaical Ceremonies* in the Council, Act. 15. and S. *Paul's anathematizing* or excommunicating *Hymenæus* and *Alexander* fallen away from, and blaſpheming, the true faith, ſute with the *Nature* of *Religion*? How the Anathemas of the *four* firſt *Councils* ſute with it? Was there no effect of *Force* and *power*, here? Then, how is there ſo in the ending controverſies by a *Judge*? Or, if there was ſuch an effect, was it not *juſt*? As for that He ſaith, of the *neceſſity of reaſon and Conviction*, there needs none as to the *proof* of the controverſy that is determined, when there is once ſuch a *conviction*, that ſuch are *appointed* to determine it, and we to *obey* them. And, where this *Conviction* is not, it ought to be; and an *erroneous conſcience*, that obligeth us to follow it, excuſeth not our errour from being culpable. Doth this Author hold all, not convicted of their fault or errour, to be freed from *Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures*? What thinks he of the 4th and 5th *Canons* of the *Engliſh Synod* under King *James*?

Pag 195. *l.* 9. *But in our caſe this* [who is the Judge?] *is the main thing in diſpute.* But, it ought not to be.

Ib. l. 14. *We muſt therefore allow every one that pretends to it to be ſuch an infallible Guide.* No: but General Councils we muſt, upon the grounds mentioned before, Note on p. 113. l. 15.

Ib. l. 17. *If we muſt not firſt be ſatisfied*, &c. You may be rationally ſatisfied. And, if you are not ſo, muſt the Judge leave his Seat?

Pag. 196. *l.* 18. *I ſay, the places of Scripture which are alledged for ſuch an infallible Judge are the moſt doubtful and controverted of any.* 1. What then? If I may be certain of the *Infallibility* of this *Interpreter* another way, than by theſe Scriptures that are urged for it, *viz.* by *Tradition*? Is it any news to our Author, that Catholicks ſay this? 2ly I may be certain of the Infallibility of this interpreter from thoſe Scriptures, not as expounded by this Interpreter, but by *Tradition*. I ſay, Tradition both hath declared ſuch Judge Infallible in neceſſaries, and hath alſo declared the true Senſe of theſe Scriptures to affirm this; Which Tradition hath not, ſo clearly, delivered the ſenſe of *all other* doubtful Scriptures: Nor, if it had, is the ſenſe of Tradition in all other Scriptures ſo eaſily to be known, at leaſt to the meaner ſort of Chriſtians, as this concerning the *Infallibility* of the Supreme *Church-Guides* in *neceſſaries*, by reaſon of the *Church's* more *evident* practice herein. See *Note* on p. 113. l. 15.

Pag. 197. *l.* 7. *I come therefore to the 2d enquiry; which is*

about the means of attaining the certain ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful
N. 1. *places, without the ſuppoſition of an infallible Guide.* The Dr here, from this p. 197. to p. 250. makes a long Digreſſion about the *means* uſed in the *Primitive* times of attaining the certain ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful places, without the ſuppoſing of an *Infalli-*
|| *See his p.* *ble* Guide. Of theſe Means he names two. One means he ſaith ||
249. was by *examining and comparing places of Scripture with all the care and judgment that may be.* Where he gathers out of the *Ancients* ſuch *Rules* as theſe.——*That the Scope and deſigne of Scripture chiefly be regarded, and the Connexion well conſidered; that nothing be interpreted contrary to the Coherents: that the ſenſe of no place is to be ſo interpreted that it hath repugnancy with others: that plain places be not interpreted by obſcure, nor a many by a few; that the contrary: that figurative expreſſions are not to be underſtood literally; nor thoſe intended in a plain ſenſe, figuratively: that examples are to be drawn from plain places to illuſtrate difficult; and, from thoſe which are certain to clear the doubtful: that in matters of doubt recourſe is to be had to the Original Tongues: that for underſtanding Scriptures we are to come with minds duly prepared to it by humility, prayer, purity of heart, love of God and our Neighbour,* &c. and many more.

N. 2. But, if, after all this comparing Scriptures, the diſpute about the ſenſe of them ſtill continues, the other *Means*, he ſaith, the Ancients ſpeak of was, the examining the *Tradition* of the *Apoſtolical Churches* from the beginning concerning the ſenſe of
|| *p.* 213. them delivered from the Apoſtles ||——*For that any one's ſetting up other expoſitions of Scripture, than the Chriſtian Church hath received from the Apoſtles times, this without any further proof diſcovers*
|| *p.* 212. *their impoſture. For* (*as he gives us it out of* Tertullian ||) *it is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Apoſtles ſhould not know the doctrine of Chriſt; or that they did not deliver to the Churches planted by them the things which they knew; or that the Churches miſunderſtood their doctrine, becauſe all the Churches were agreed in one common faith* [*and in an expoſition of Scriptures contrary to theirs*]; *and therefore there is all the reaſon to believe, that ſo univerſal conſent muſt ariſe from ſome common cauſe, which can be ſuppoſed to be no other than the common delivery of it by all the Apoſtles.* Again p. 249. He ſpeaks on this manner——*If after all this* [i.e. the examining and comparing Scriptures] *the diſpute ſtill continues, then, if it be againſt the ancient Rule of Faith univerſally received* [perhaps he means the *Apoſtles Creed*] *that is a ſufficient preſcription againſt any opinion; if not againſt the rule of faith in expreſs words, but about the ſenſe of it, then, if ancient General Councils have determined it, which had greater opportunities of knowing the ſenſe of the Apoſtoli-*

cal

cal Church than we, it is reasonable, we should yield to them; but, if there have been none such, then the unanimous consent of Fathers is to be taken, &c.

For the *first* of these *means*, the attaining the certain sense of Scripture by *comparing* Texts, *&c.* 1. First; the Reader may observe, that, if this proves the non-necessity of an *Infallible Guide*, so it doth the non-necessity of *any Guide* at all, as to teaching us the meaning of the Scriptures. For, in this first means, no repairing at all to our *Spiritual Guides* fallible or infallible, for the sense is mentioned. 2ly. I grant, that there is a means of attaining a sufficient certainty of the sense of some *obscure* places of Scripture from others more *clear*, without the necessity of any other infallible Guide therein; and that the *Fathers* also have laid down many excellent *Rules* concerning this and practised them, in disputing against Hereticks. 3ly. The *more*, and the *more certain* these means are for knowing the sense of Scripture, the more they seem to inferr the *Infallibility* and non-erring of the Supreme Governours of the Church met in Council *herein*, and the more security of their Subject's, as to all necessary faith, relying on their Judgment. Nor do I see any thing that can be replied here; but, That these Governours *well knowing* the right sense of Scriptures, yet by *ambition*, *interest*, and several other *passions* may be corrupted from *teaching* it; and also may be induced to define as an Article of their Faith to all posterity the contrary *falshoods*; and themselves also first take their *Oath* of their *belief* of the truth thereof; which, though a very strange charge, yet might pass for a more tolerable exception, if those who will *judge* of this swerving and erring of Councils were themselves exempt from any such *passions* or *interests*, or could well know when they are biass'd with them; but otherwise it seems a very poor subterfuge; yet the only one they can alledge for disobedience to Councils. 4ly. It is here to be remembred, that, if this means by *comparing Scriptures* &c. (named before) be not such as *all* men, those of weaker judgments and secular employments, & void of literature can *use* and *practise*, this *Infallible Guide* for the certain sense of Scripture will still remain necessary to *such*, where useless to some others. 5ly. That, If any others of more liberal education, more leisure for study, of better capacity, after such means used, shall remain still in *doubt* concerning any such *Texts* in matters necessary, as suppose in the *Trinity*; or *Deity* of our *Lord* Christ; our Lords *Satisfaction*; *Justification*, &c; here also will be need of an Infallible Guide, or Judge to decide these things to him. Or, if all well *capable* by their parts or condition of life of using this *means*, yet, otherwise

N. 3.

therwise employed, *de facto* do not use it, to these also this Infallible Guide is necessary, to supply the *effect* of such studies.

N. 4. As for the 2*d means*, viz. The Ancients urging the *general Exposition* and sense of Scriptures testified in the *Apostolical Churches* to be conformed to, *Catholicks* affirm; that this, *viz.* the *Apostolick Churches* their unanimously delivering such a doctrine or sense of Scripture as received first from the Apostles, was always held to be *infallible* and not liable to errour; and all Christians held obliged to believe or embrace such a doctrine or sense of Scripture so generally consented in; and the *dissenters* and opposers thereof always held by the same united and consenting *Apostolical Churches* for *Hereticks* in the *Faith*. To which *Traditive* Doctrine, I add here, or any *necessary* and evident *Deduction* made, by them, from such a traditive doctrine. In both which, the *Tradition*, or the *Deduction*, the Church was constantly believed to be so preserved, by God's providence over it, and his Holy Spirit abiding with it, as not to err in any *necessaries*. And the unanimous consent of these Churches concerning any doctrine to be Apostolical, however their minds were made known, whether by *Communicatory Letters*, or *Provincial Synods*, (for, it could not be, in these times of persecution, by a *Council General*) had then the self same authority, as afterwards is the Decrees and Definitions of Councils. And thus is the Dr in urging the 2d means of knowing the true sense of Scripture fallen upon the Infallibility herein of the Church. And this was the Infallible Guide in the first times, whose *Tradition* and *Ordination*, for matters of our faith, *Irenæus* saith, || Christians must have followed and believed, had the *Apostles* left us no *Scriptures*: and consequently, *Dissenters* had been held no less *Hereticks*——*Siquibus* (saith he speaking of the present Churches) *de aliquâ modicâ quæstione* [how much more in greater] *disceptatio esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas* [i.e. by succession] *recurrere ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli conversati sunt, & ab eis de præsente quæstione sumere quod certum & re liquidum est* [what was the certain and cleare truth, to which he was to adhere.] *Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem Scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias? cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes Barbarorum, eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine charactere vel atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis salutem, & veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes* &c.

|| *l.* 3. *c.* 4.

N. 5. Neither was this *general Consent* of *Churches* then consulted or repaired to only concerning their conserving of the *Written Rule* of *Faith*, the *Canon* of *Scripture*, or the *Creed*, that they received

ceived from the Apoſtles; the perpetual conſervation of which in the Church the *Fathers* urged againſt ſome *groſſer* kind of *Hereticks* denying the ſame Creed and ſome part at leaſt of this Canon; but alſo was conſulted and repaired-to concerning the *ſenſe* wherein the *Scriptures* and this *Creed* were underſtood by theſe *Churches*, ſo often as diſputes in thoſe times were raiſed about it by other *Hereticks* more *refined*; and who admitted the *Scriptures* and the *Creed*, but varied concerning the *ſenſe* of them in ſeveral points. Againſt both which Hereticks the Fathers urged the *preſcription* of the *preſent* teſtimony of theſe Churches (to thoſe who would conſult them) concerning the *Tradition* deſcending to them from the times of the Apoſtles. And *Tertullian* frequently complains, as of ſome *Hereticks* not receiving the Scriptures, ſo of others *miſinterpreting* them. || *Iſta Hæreſis non recipit quædam Scripturas; & ſi recipit, adjectionibus & detractionibus ad diſpoſitionem inſtituti ſui intervertit: & ſi recipit, non recipit integras: & ſi aliquatenus hæreſ. c. 17. integras præſtat, nihilominus, diverſas expoſitiones commentata, convertit. Tantum veritati obſtrepit adulter ſenſus, quantum & corruptor ſtilus.* And afterward——*Dicunt a nobis potius adulteria Scripturarum & expoſitionum mendacia inferri.* And——*ubi apparuerit eſſe veritatem diſciplinæ & fidei Chriſtianæ, illic erit veritas Scripturarum & omnium traditionum Chriſtianarum.* Where I note his urging the Church's *conſenting Expoſition* of *Scriptures*, as well as *reception* of Scriptures, as preſcribing againſt *Hereticks*. || De præſcript. adv. &c.

Ibi. 11. *It will not I hope be denied, that the Primitive Chriſtian Church had a certain way of underſtanding the ſenſe of doubtful places, as far as it was neceſſary to be underſtood; and that they wanted no means which Chriſt had appointed for the ending of controverſies.* This is willingly granted; and it is contended, that this inerrability in *Neceſſaries* accompanied the Clergy, and preſerved the Church in the unity of a true faith in *all*, even the *Primitive*, times; being annexed to the whole Body, or much major part of this *Clergy*, not only when *met* in a *General Council*, but out of it alſo, whenever, and however, they manifeſted a *concurrence* in their *judgment*, and agreement in their doctrine; whether it were by ſeveral *Provincial Councils* aſſembled; or perhaps only by ſome one convened in the place more infeſted with ſome new and dangerous *errour*, and ratified by the *Apoſtolick See*, and other coordinate Churches; or not oppoſed and cenſured but tacitly admitted by them; Or by their Communicatory and Synodical Letters; Or whether in their publick Liturgies and Offices: Or in a general Conſent in their publick Writings, and explications of *Chriſtian Doctrine*. In none of which as to the Doctrine *Neceſſary*

ceſſary, the whole *Body* of the Clergy or that which in any diſſent is to be accepted for the whole, did ever *erre*. Of which times before *Conſtantine*, and the firſt General Council of *Nice*, thus Mr *Thorndike* in his *Epilogue* l. 1. c. 8.—*The daily intercourſe, intelligence, and correſpondence between Churches, without thoſe Aſſemblies of Repreſentatives we call Councils, was a thing ſo viſibly practiſed by the Catholick Church from the beginning, that thereupon, I conceive, it may be called a* ſtanding Council, *in regard of the continual ſettling of troubles, ariſing in ſome part and tending to queſtion the peace of the whole, by the conſent of other Churches concerned*: [which ſettlement was] *had and obtained by means of this mutual intelligence and correſpondence. The holding of Councils being a way of far greater diſpatch; but the expreſs conſent of Churches, obtained upon the place, being a more certain foundation of peace.* And afterward he affirms—*That the ſucceſſion of Paſtors alledged by* Irenæus *and* Tertullian *to convince the Hereticks of their time; by S.* Auguſtine, *and* Optatus *to convince the* Donatiſts *to be Schiſmaticks, proceeded wholly upon ſuppoſition of daily intercourſe and correſpondence between Churches, as of force to conclude particular Churches by conſent of the whole.* And this agreement in all times hath kept the *Faith* of the *Church* ſteady and *uniform*.

Ib. l. (4). *If no ſuch thing was then heard of as an infallible Judge, it is a plain demonſtration they thought there was none appointed.* Such thing was then heard of, *viz.* the conſenting Teſtimony (however had) of the preſent *Apoſtolical Churches* concerning former Traditive Doctrines, or neceſſary Deductions from them, was accepted and ſubmitted to by all, ſave *Hereticks*, as *infallible*. And, after the Church's liberty obtained of aſſembling *General Councils*, that of *Nice* was in thoſe times repaired to as an *Infallible* Judge by the whole *Body* of Chriſtianity for deciding that great Controverſy concerning our *Lord's Divinity*; and the *Deciſion* thereof afterward accepted by the whole Church Catholick, as *Infallible*.

Annotations on §. 13. *Of the way uſed in the* Primitive Church *for finding the ſenſe of Scripture.*

PAg. 201. *l.* 5. *What courſe now doth* Irenæus *take to clear the ſenſe of Scripture in theſe controverted places? Doth he tell them that God hath appointed infallible Guides in his Church, to whom appeal was to be made in all ſuch caſes? Nothing like it through his whole*

Book,

Book. Though the Dr here only urgeth a *Negative* Argument, which often fails; and though, as to *Hereticks*, utterly denying *Church-Infallibility*, the *Fathers* had their liberty to chuſe rather to convince them upon ſome other *Principles* by both ſides agreed on; Yet *Irenæus* we find againſt theſe Hereticks frequently pleaded this Church-Infallibility as not reaſonably rejectible by them. *viz.* Urged the *conſenting Teſtimony* of the preſent *Apoſtolical Churches* as no way fallible in relating and delivering to poſterity the former *Apoſtolical Tradition*. For which ſee his l. 1. c. 3.——*Hanc prædicationem & hanc fidem Eccleſia* (*velut dixi*) *adepta, quanquam per totum mundum diſperſa, diligenter conſervat, quaſi unam domum inhabitans: & ſimiliter his credit, velut unam animam & idem cor habens, & conſonè hæc prædicat & docet, ac tradit, velut uno ore prædita. Nam linguæ in mundo diſſimiles ſunt, verùm virtus Traditionis una & eadem eſt. Prædicatio veritatis ubique lucet, & illuminat omnes homines ad cognitionem veritatis venire volentes.* And ſee the four firſt Chapters of *lib.* 3. where he hath much to this purpoſe. There he ſaith in the Preface——*Reſiſtens eis pro ſolâ & vivificâ fide, quam ab Apoſtolis Eccleſia percepit, & diſtribuit filiis ſuis. Eccleſia* [i.e. Patres eccleſiæ, that inſtruct the others]. And Ibid. c. 2. he ſaith——*Ad eam Traditionem, quæ eſt ab Apoſtolis, quæ per ſucceſſiones Presbyterorum in Eccleſiis cuſtoditur, provocamus eos* [i.e. Hæreticos]. And afterward accuſeth them——*Neque Scripturis, neque Traditioni* [of the ſenſe the Church gives to the Scriptures] *conſentire eos.* c. 3.--*Traditionem itaque* (ſaith he) *Apoſtolorum in toto mundo manifeſtatam in Eccleſiâ* [i.e. in the unanimous conſent of the preſent Church] *adeſt perſpicere omnibus, qui vera velint audire.* And then appealing to the preeminent authority of the *Roman* Church he thus goes on.——*Maximæ & antiquiſſimæ & omnibus cognitæ a glorioſiſſimis Apoſtolis* Petro & Paulo *Romæ fundatæ & conſtitutæ Eccleſiæ, eam, quam habet ab Apoſtolis, traditionem, & annunciatam hominibus fidem, per ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum pervenientem uſque ad nos, indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo vel per ſui placentiam malam, vel vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem & malam ſententiam, præterquam oportet, colligunt. Ad hanc enim Eccleſiam propter potentiorem principalitatem* [becauſe a Petro & Paulo fundata, hence frequent Appeals from thither all parts] *neceſſe eſt omnem convenire eccleſiam, hoc eſt, eos, qui ſunt undique fideles; in quâ ſemper, ab his qui ſunt undique, conſervata eſt ea, quæ eſt ab Apoſtolis, Traditio.* [ſomwhat like that of S. *Cyprian* Ep. 55.--*Poſt iſta adhuc* (ſaith he ſpeaking of two Schiſmaticks) *navigare audent, & ad* Petri Cathedram *atque ad Eccleſiam principalem, unde unitas Sacerdotalis*

Sacerdotalis exorta eſt, a Schiſmaticis & profanis literas ferre; nec cogitare, eos eſſe Romanos (quorum fides, Apoſtolo prædicante, laudata eſt), ad quos perfidia *habere* non poteſt *acceſſum*]. And c. 4.—*Tantæ igitur oſtenſiones cùm ſint hæc, non oportet adhuc quærere apud alios veritatem, quam facile eſt ab Eccleſiâ ſumere.* And ſee what was quoted before *Note* on p. 197. l. 7.—*Quid enim, ſi quibus de aliquâ modicâ quæſtione diſceptatio eſſet* &c. In which places, ſuppoſe a *fallibility* of the *conſenting-Teſtimony* of the *preſent* Church-Governours, when conſulting concerning the Traditive faith that hath deſcended to them, and all this *Father* ſaith falls to the ground.

Pag. 204. *l.* 13. *And ſurely then he did not imagine, that God had appointed an infallible Judge on purpoſe to prevent the being of Hereſies by giving an infallible ſenſe of Scripture.* Yes: ſuch an infallible Judge hence the more neceſſary, to cure and remedy the *Hereſies*, which, *Tertullian* ſaith, the *Scriptures* were ſo framed, as not to prevent. Neither hath God, in providing ſuch a *Judge*, conſtrained alſo all mens free wills to believe his *Infallibility* and acquieſce in his judgment. And ſo the—*Oportet eſſe Hæreſes* may be verified ſtill

Pag. 207. *l.* 4. *The ſenſe they* [the Hereticks] *gave of Scripture was contrary to the Doctrine of faith* &c. *Which he* [Irenæus] *calls the unmoveable rule of faith received in Baptiſm; and which the Church diſperſed over the earth did equally receive in all places with a wonderful conſent.* If the Dr here would reſtrain the *Father's* urging the Teſtimony of the Apoſtolical Churches againſt Hereticks only to the Tradition of the *Canon* of *Scriptures*, or the Rule of Faith *the Creed*, Profeſſed in their *Baptiſme*; we muſt know, that they urged not the concurrent Teſtimony of the preſent Churches only for *thoſe* againſt ſome *groſs* Hereticks, that denied the *Text* and *Letter* of them; but alſo againſt others more ſubtile, perverting ſuch a *ſenſe* of them, as theſe conſenting Churches pretend did was *Apoſtolical*. See *Irenæus* l. 3. c. 2.—*Cùm ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accuſationem convertuntur ipſarum Scripturarum*: where amongſt other their accuſations he alledgeth this—*quia variè ſint dictæ* [ambiguous in their ſenſe] *& quia non poſſit ex his inveniri veritas ab his, qui neſciant traditionem.*—*Cùm autem ad eam iterùm traditionem* [i.e. concerning the right ſenſe of theſe Scriptures] *quæ eſt ab Apoſtolis, quæ per ſucceſſiones presbyterorum in Eccleſiis cuſtoditur, provocamus eos, qui adverſantur traditioni* [i. e. Eccleſiæ], *dicent ſe*, &c.—*Evenit itaque neque Scripturis jam, neque traditioni, conſentire eos.* And the words c. 4. cited before—*Quid enim*

&

ſi quibus de aliquâ modicâ quæſtione, &c. ſhew, he holds ſuch *concurrent Teſtimony* valid concerning any ſuch *Tradition*, though there had been no *Scriptures*: and indeed there ſeems no reaſon why theſe Churches ſhould be more credited in their teſtimony, when pretending one thing Tradition Apoſtolical, than when another, though theſe things perhaps be not of an equal *importance*.

Pag. 208. *l.* 1. *Which Tradition they* [the Hereticks] *accounted the key to unlock all the difficulties of Scripture.* Hereticks indeed ſo accounted their *falſe* tradition; but ſo the Churches alſo their *true* Tradition.

Ib. l. 12. Irenæus *appeals to the moſt eminent Churches, And eſpecially that of* Rome, *becauſe of the great reſort of Chriſtians thither*, [where he omits the *Neceſſe eſt*]. No. *Propter potentiorem principalitatem* (ſaith the Father): which *Principalitas potentior, a* Petro & Paulo *fundata* cauſed the great reſort of Chriſtians thither; *propter quam ad hanc neceſſe eſt omnem convenire eccleſiam*, &c ſee the words at large cited before Annot. on p. 201. l. 5.

Ib. l. 17. *And knew of no ſuch tradition as the* Valentinians *pretended to.* But this was not all: the Fathers pleaded alſo in the Churches an Anti-tradition, true and Apoſtolical; witneſſed by the *unanimous teſtimony* of the *preſent Apoſtolical* Churches; as the others did a *falſe*, and *unteſtifyed*.

Ib. l. (9). *And ſuppoſing no Scriptures, we muſt then have followed the Tradition of the moſt ancient and Apoſtolical Churches.* Thus ſaid *Irenæus*. I add: and this Tradition witneſſed by the preſent Churches muſt be in *neceſſaries infallible*; elſe Chriſtian Religion would be liable to *errour* in ſuch *neceſſaries*.

Pag. 209. *l.* 14. *But* Irenæus *knew nothing of any infallible Judge to determine the ſenſe of Scripture.* For the contrary ſee *Note* on p. 197. l. 7. and l. 11.

Pag. 210. *l.* 2. *There muſt be a certain unalterable Rule of faith*, &c. Now this Author removes his diſcourſe from *Irenæus* to *Tertullian*. Who alſo, as *Irenæus*, ſpeaks not only of the *Creed* profeſſed in *Baptiſm*, nor of ſome *chief Articles* but of the whole doctrine of faith, and manners, neceſſary to ſalvation, as alſo of the *right* ſenſe of Scriptures *controverted*, that it was delivered to, and depoſited in, the Chriſtian Churches by our Lord and his Apoſtles, and from the *unanimous agreement* of the ſame *Churches* therein, in any controverſy made concerning it, might be certainly learnt and known. What hath been ſaid of *Irenæus* needs not be repeated concerning him: both do tread in the ſame ſteps, and *Tertullian* had peruſed the works of *Irenæus* ||; both referr Chriſtians to the conſentient Teſtimony of the *Apoſtolical Churches* in any

|| *See contra Valentin. c.* 5.

doubting in matters of faith, or diſputed ſenſe of Scripture; a theſe *Churches firmly* conſerving and *rightly* delivering the *Tradition Apoſtolical*, and as not liable to *errour* herein. Of theſe Churches thus he, *De præſcript.* c. 19.——*Ubi* [or, *apud quos*] *apparuerit eſſe veritatem diſciplinæ & fidei Chriſtianæ* [delivered to them by the Apoſtles] *illic erit veritas Scripturarum, & expoſitionum, & omnium traditionum Chriſtianarum.* [And how this, if theſe conſentient Churches not held *infallible* in rightly delivering
c. 21. ſuch Tradition]? And——*Quid Apoſtolis Chriſtus revelaverit, & hic præſcribam, non aliter probari debere, niſi per eaſdem Eccleſias.* ——*Proinde conſtare, omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis Eccleſiis Apoſtolicis matricibus & originalibus fidei conſpiret*, veritati deputandam; *id ſine* dubio *tenentem, quod eccleſia ab Apoſtolis, Apoſtoli a Chriſto, Chriſtus a Deo ſuſcepit.* [Theſe Churches therefore in no age are errable, in conſerving or delivering ſuch doctrine: for, elſe, how any certain, that not in *Tertullian's?*]. —— *Supereſt ergo uti demonſtremus, an hæc noſtra doctrina, cujus regulam ſupra edidimus, de Apoſtolorum traditione cenſeatur.* ——Which he demonſtrates thus——*Communicamus cum Eccleſiis Apoſtolicis, quod nulla doctrina diverſa* [facit]. *hoc eſt teſtimonium veritatis.* And after, c. 36. ſpeaking of the Apoſtolical Churches, in any diverſity of doctrine, to be conſulted, he goes on thus—— *Proxima eſt tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longè es a Macedoniâ, habes Philippos &c. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis* [Affricanis] *authoritas præſto eſt:* where he advanceth *this Church* above the reſt, as alſo *Irenæus.*——*Felix eccleſia*, ſaith he, *cui totam doctrinam Apoſtoli cum ſanguine ſuo profuderunt. Videamus quid didicerit* [i.e. hæc eccleſia], *quid docuerit, cùm Affricanis quoque eccleſiis conteſſerarit.* Then, naming ſome part of *Its* Faith and doctrine againſt the contrary of the *Heretick*s of thoſe days, *adverſus hanc inſtitutionem*, ſaith he, *neminem recipit*; [into its communion]. Then concludes——*Si hæc ita ſe habent, ut veritas nobis adjudicetur*, &c, *non eſſe admittendos hæreticos ad eandem de Scripturis provocationem, quos ſine Scripturis* [i.e. by the infallible Teſtimony of the Church diſcovering their faith not right] *Probamus ad Scripturas non pertinere.* And——*Illic* [or apud eos] *igitur & Scripturarum & expoſitionum adulteratio deputanda eſt, ubi diverſitas invenitur doctrinæ* [from the conſentient Churches]. This occurrs in his Book of *Preſcriptions* againſt *Heretick*s. In his Books againſt *Marcion* are found like things. From which *authority*
‖ l. 4. c. 5. alſo of the *Apoſtolical Churches*, he ſaith there, ‖ we receive the *Canon* of *Scripture*——*Eadem authoritas eccleſiarum Apoſtolicarum cæteris quoque patrocinabitur Evangeliis, quæ* [Evangelia] *proinde*

per

per illas, & ſecundum illas, habemus.

Ib. l. (9). *He* [Tertullian] *ſhews this Rule of Faith is by repeating the Articles of the Ancient Creed.* See *Note* on p. 207. l. 4. I hope He will not confine the conſentient Church's authority and teſtimony *only* to the *expreſs Articles* of the *Creed* uſed in *Tertullian's* time; for, then its teſtimony will not or may not have the ſame verity in thoſe of the *Athanaſian.*

Pag. 213. *l.* 11. *Diſcovers their impoſture.* Let the Reader well conſider, whether the *Dr's tranſlation*, in this and the precedent page, doth not alſo make *Tertullian* clearly enough affirm *Church-infallibility*; and whether he brings not witneſſes againſt himſelf.

Pag. 214. *l.* 14. *Thus* Tertullian *lays down the rules of finding out the ſenſe of controverted places of Scripture without the leaſt inſinuation of an infallibility placed in the Guides of the Church for determining the certain ſenſe of them.* Contrary. If we Review what hath been ſaid, *Tertullian* lays down a certain *Rule* of finding out the *ſenſe* of controverted places of Scripture: *viz.* a *general Conſent* of the *Apoſtolical Churches*, touching ſuch ſenſe, traditional, and deſcending from the Apoſtles; which *Conſent* ought to determine ſuch *ſenſe* unto them.

Ib. l. (5). *Preſcription, or juſt exception againſt their pleading* (*for ſo preſcription ſignifies in him*). The Plea *Tertullian* uſeth againſt the novelty of ancient Hereticks, as alſo *Roman-Catholicks* do ſtill againſt the *Proteſtants*, namely this—*Mea eſt poſſeſſio: olim poſſideo, prior poſſideo.* c. 38. And this—‖ *Id eſt dominicum & verum, quod eſt prius traditum: id autem extraneum & falſum, quod eſt poſteriùs immiſſum*, I ſay this *plea* ſeems to imply more iucluded in the word *Preſcription*, than the Dr allows. *viz.* includes not only a juſt exception againſt their pleadings, but a juſt plea againſt their exeeptions. But this ſhall make no contention between us. ‖ c. 31.

Pag 215. *l. ult. And makes that ſufficient evidence of the truth of a body, that it is the object of three ſenſes, of ſight, and touch, and hearing. Which is the ſame way of arguing we make uſe of againſt Tranſubſtantiation.* And it is granted a ſufficient evidence, where no *Divine Revelation* intervenes declaring ſuch *arguing* miſtaken. Which, in the matter of our Lord's Reſurrection, there doth not. And in vain had *Marcion* made any ſuch pretence herein againſt theſe ſenſes where he could produce no Divine Revelation for it.

Pag. 216. *l.* 14. *And the univerſal reception* [i.e. by the Churches] *of the true Goſpels.* *Univerſal Reception.* Which

Tertullian urgeth as an *infallible* proof of the *truth* of theſe Goſpels. See his words *Contra Marcion.* l. 4. before in *Note* on p. 210. l 2. As alſo, Ibid. (contrary to what the Dr ſaith below) *his calling in an infallible Guide,* [the ſame Churches] *for giving a certain ſenſe of Scripture.*

Pag. 218. *l.* (6.) *Hitherto we find nothing* &c. Concerning this let the former places || produced out of them bear witneſs. Though this hath the infirmity of a Negative argument.

|| *Note on p.* 201.

Pag. 219. *l.* 1. *I now proceed to* Clemens *of* Alexandria. *And therefore ſo* muſt I; though methinks he hath led his Reader and me a great way from the *Conſideration* of his *Principles.* He that reads the 7th Book of his *Stromata* here cited, as he will find much of ſtudying the Scriptures, and learning Demonſtrations from thence againſt *Hereticks,* ſo will he of the *Unity* of the *Church,* contradiſtinct to *Hereſies*; and of the *verity* of its Traditions. Of which he ſaith there——*Num ergo, ſi quis pacta conventa non obſervaverit* [i.e. adhærendo Regulæ Eccleſiaſticæ], *& tranſgreſſus fuerit eam, quæ ſit apud nos, confeſſionem, propter eum, qui non ſtetit ſuæ profeſſioni, abſtinebimus nos quoque a veritate* [i.e. hujus confeſſionis]? And he cals this afterward *via regia & trita*——*Non dubitaverit quiſpiam viam ingredi propter diſſenſionem* [of ſome others ſtraying] *ſed utetur viâ regiâ & tritâ & ſejuncta a periculo: ita cùm alii alia dicant, de veritate* [hujus Confeſſionis & Regulæ Eccleſiaſticæ] *non eſt diſcedendum, ſed eſt exactiùs & diligentiùs inquirenda ejus exactiſſima & accuratiſſima cognitio.* Ibid. he ſaith, ——*In ſolâ veritate & antiquâ Eccleſiâ* [i.e. *Eccleſiâ* deriving its doctrine from Antiquity] *eſt perfectiſſima cognitio, & ea quæ eſt reverâ optima hæreſis, id eſt, electio.* And——*Homo Dei eſſe, & Domino fidelis eſſe, perdidit, qui adverſus Eccleſiaſticam recalcitravit traditionem, & in humanarum hæreſum deſiluit opiniones.* There he ſaith——*Qui in ignoratione quidem verſantur ſunt gentes: qui autem in ſcientiâ, vera eccleſia: qui verò in opinione, ii qui ſectantur hæreſes.* And afterward——*Exciſo oſtio, & muro Eccleſiæ jam perfoſſo, veritatem tranſgredientes efficiuntur principes ac duces myſteriorum animæ impiorum:* and then ſhewing, as alſo *Irenæus* and *Tertullian,* the Doctrine of the *Church* ancienter, that of *Hereticks* later, he goes on,——*Ex iis quæ dicta ſunt manifeſtum eſſe exiſtimo, unam eſſe veram Eccleſiam, eam quæ verè eſt antiqua——quam conantur hæreſes in multas diſcindere. Et ſubſtantiâ ergo & cogitatione & principio & excellentiâ, ſolam eſſe dicimus; quam etiam* [dicimus] *antiquam & Catholicam Eccleſiam, in unitatem unius fidei, quæ eſt ex propriis teſtamentis* [i.e. contained in the Scriptures] *in quibus Dei voluntate per unum hominem congregat eos, qui jam ſunt ordinati,*

|| quos

‖ *quos prædestinavit Deus*, &c.——*Cæterùm* (saith he) *Ecclesiæ quoque eminentia, sicut principium constructionis, est ex unitate, omnia alia superans, & nihil habens sibi simile vel æquale.* And that—— *Fuit una omnium Apostolorum sicut doctrina, ita etiam traditio.*—— *Ex hæresibus autem, aliæ quidem appellantur ex nomine,——aliæ ex loco,——aliæ ex gente——aliæ ex propriis dogmatibus*, &c. [A *parallel* to which, both in his *description* of the *Church* and *Heresies*, may be observed in our present times]. These things then he hath of the *Church* there, where he hath those things our Authour brings of the *Scriptures*. And, in all these things, he seems to own and remit us to this *Church*, *antiqua, sola, una, eminens & omnia alia superans*, as a *Guide* that cannot fail us in *necessary* truth. And as he presseth the studying of the *Scriptures* to the *contemplative*, so he leaves the *unity* of the *Church* and the *verity* of its *doctrine* as a secure refuge for all the rest, that cannot intend such studies. ‖ *Act.* 13.48

Pag. 222. *l.* (10) Stephen *was against rebaptizing any Hereticks, and the others* [the Eastern and African Bishops] *were for rebaptizing all. Any Hereticks*; i.e. *such*, whose former *Baptisme* was not, for want of a *right Forme*, nulled ; the baptizing of whom, when returning to the Church, was indeed no Rebaptization ; and thus *S. Stephen* and *latter Councils* well accord. Of whose sanctity and orthodoxnesse thus *Vincentius Lerinensis*, ‖ after these Councils.——*Quo quisque floreret religiosior, eo promptiùs novellis adinventionibus contrairet. Exemplis talibus plena sunt omnia. Sed ne longum fiat, unum aliquod, & hoc ab Apostolicâ potissimùm Sede, sumemus: ut omnes luce clariùs videant, beatorum Apostolorum beata successio quantâ vi semper, quanto studio, quantâ contentione defenderit suscepta semel religionis integritatem*: speaking of this *Stephen*. Meanwhile the affection & Reverence, this Author pretends to *Antiquity* and the *Holy Fathers*, is not unliable to suspition, when he upon every or rather no occasion given, endeavours to uncover their nakednesse and lay open their deficiencies, and divisions. Those that defend their departure from the novelties of the *Roman* Church by their retreat to *Antiquity*, and the doctrine of the *Fathers*, methinks should have a greater tenderness of Their Reputation. But here, meanwhile, the more He aggravates the dissentings about this point, the more he confirms the necessity of the *Infallibility* of General Councils for setling such *Truths* and allaying such *Contests* to which Councils we owe the present peace, that the Church in latter times enjoys in this matter, once so much agitated. ‖ *c.* 9.

Pag. 225 *l.* (13) *What course was taken in this important Controversy* [with *Samosatenus* concerning the divinity of Christ]

to

to find out the certain ſenſe of Scripture? Do they appeale to any infallible Guides? Nothing like it. But in the Councils of Antioch *&c.* The ſenſe of Scripture may be cleared either by comparing *Scriptures*, &c, or, by examining *Church-Tradition*; for confuting *Hereſies* both ways are uſed: but not neceſſary therefore, that all writings againſt them uſe *both*: Or that Councils condemning them *regiſter* the reaſon of their condemnation. But ſo it is, that this Council of *Antioch* in their Epiſtle to *Paulus Samoſatenus* do uſe both: as they urge the *Scriptures*, ſo alſo the *Church's* conſentient Tradition in theſe words——*Decrevimus fidem ſcripto edere & exponere, quam a principio acceepimus, & habemus traditam & ſervatam in Catholicâ & Sanctâ Eccleſiâ uſque in hodiernum diem.* And——*Qui Filium Dei non eſſe Deum prædicat, hunc alienum eſſe ab* Eccleſiaſtica regula *arbitramur*; *& omnes Eccleſiæ Catholicæ nobiſcum conſentiunt.*

Pag. 228. *l.* 1. *I would adviſe them to be converſant in the Divine Oracles.* || S. *Athanaſius* in all this gives very good advice: for, in the *Father's* confuting Hereſies by *Scriptures* and by *Councils*, Scriptures have the prime place; with *Athanaſius's* limitation there, writing to Biſhops, and thoſe, *quibus gratia data eſt, ut diſcernant ſpiritualia*; whilſt he ſaith there——*Contra Arian. Orat.* 1. *ſimplex & non firmiter inſtitutus, dum ſolummodo verba* [Scripturæ] *conſiderat, ſtatim illorum aſtutiis ſeducitur.* Eſpecially theſe Scripture-proofs are neceſſary to Biſhops, when dealing with Adverſaries that contemn *Councils*; as now alſo Scriptures are urged by Catholicks to *Proteſtants* declining *Church-Authority*.

|| *Athanaſ. cont. Arian.*

Ib. l. 7. *But did not the Arians plead Scripture as well as they? how then could the Scripture end this Controverſy which did ariſe about the ſenſe of Scripture? This Objection was never ſo much as thought of in thoſe days.* What thinks He of *Tertullian's Preſcription*, againſt *Hereticks* quoting Scriptures, from Church-authority declaring *Apoſtolical Tradition* concerning the *ſenſe* of ſuch Scriptures? c. 15.——*Scripturas* (ſaith he) *obtendunt & hac ſuâ audaciâ ſtatim quoſdam movent: in ipſo verò congreſſu firmos quidem fatigant, infirmos capiunt, medios cum ſcrupulo dimittunt.* And ——*Quid promovebis exercitatiſſime Scripturarum, cùm ſi quid defenderis negetur ex diverſo, ſi quid negaveris defendatur?——Hunc igitur potiſſimum gradum obſtruimus, non admittendi eos ad ullam de Scripturis diſputationem*: i.e. by transferring the Controverſy to be tried by the conſentient Doctrine and Tradition of the Church Catholick. Or, what thinks he of the words of *Athanaſius* in the ſame *Oration* that is here quoted, adviſing thoſe he writ to thus,

——*Zelum*

——*Zelum Domino Zelate, & retentâ Patrum fide, quam Patres qui* Nicææ *convenerant scripto professi sunt, Ne sustinueritis eos, qui contra eam novis rebus student, etiamsi dictiones ex sacris literis scribant?*

Ib. l. 9. *They did not in the least desert the proofs of Scripture, because their adversaries made use of it too.* No: why should they, the true sense of which was on their side, and this also evident enough to some mens reason? But, to those not by this way convinced, they pressed also the universal *Tradition* of the *Church* and the *Definitions* of its *General Councils*, as infallible, and to be submitted to by all private judgments. For which to view (this Author, he speaks of,) *Athanasius*: See the beginning of his Epistle to *Epictetus* Bishop of *Corinth*——*Ego urbitrabar* (saith he) *omnium, quotquot unquam fuere, hæreticorum inanem garrulitatem* Nicæno *Concilio* sedatam esse. *Nam Fides, quæ inibi a Patribus secundum sacras Scripturas tradita, & confessionibus confirmata est, satis mihi idonea efficaxque videbatur ad omnem impietatem evertendam &c.* And therefore he saith, the Bishops thereof afterward ——*diversis Consiliis istos lucifugas, quæ Arii sunt sapientes, communi calculo unius spiritus incitatu anathemate percussêrunt——Quâ igitur audaciâ sit, ut post tanti Concilii authoritatem, disceptationes aut quæstiones instituantur?*——And——*Quæ ita manifestò prava perversaque sunt, ea curiosiùs tractare non oportet, ne contentiosis hominibus ambigua videantur; sed tantummodò ad ea respondendum est quod ipsum per se sufficit,* ea orthodoxæ Ecclesiæ non esse, *neque majores nostros ita sensisse.* And——*Si vultis filii Patrum esse, non debetis sentire diversa ab iis quæ Patres ipsi conscripserunt.* Again, in the beginning of his Epistle to the *African* Bishops --*Sufficiunt ea, quæ* Niceæ *confessa fuere satisque per se virium habent quemadmodum superiùs diximus, tum ad subversionem impii dogmatis, tum ad tutelam utilitatemque Ecclesiasticæ doctrinæ.* And——*Neque Deum metuerunt ita dicentem*; Ne transmoveas terminos æternos quos posuerunt Patres tui: & Qui accusat Patrem aut Matrem morte moriatur; *neque patres nostros quicquam reveriti sunt denunciantes anathema, si quis contraria sua ipsorum confessioni sentiret.*——*Plusquam decem Synodos jam instituerant &c.*——*Verbum autem illud Domini per Oecumenicam* Niceæ *Synodum in æternum manet.* And in the close of that Epistle after citing the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 11. 2.——*Laudo vos quod, quemadmodum tradidi vobis traditiones, ita eas servatis,* he goes on——*Ipsa enim* Nicæna *Synodus* revera *trophæum columnaque est, ubi omnes hæreses inscriptæ ostentui sunt* (alluding to Col. 2. 15.): then declaring how this Council established the Faith, he saith——*Quam Patres statuissent de fide in Filium, id statim adjectum volnere, Credimus & in Spiritum Sanctum.* And in his Epistle

de

de Synodis he ſaith of theſe Fathers, ſhewing their juſt authority in matters of faith, that—*In negotio Paſchatis placuit ut adderetur*, Viſum eſt, *ut omnes obtemperarent. De fide verò non ſcripſerunt* Viſum eſt; *ſed*, Ad iſtum modum credit Catholica Eccleſia; *& ſtatim confeſſio ipſa* credendi *adjuncta eſt, ut oſtenderent eam non novam eſſe ſententiam ſed Apoſtolicam, & quæ ipſi ſcripſiſſent non eſſe ſua inventa, ſed Apoſtolorum documenta.*

Pag. 223. *l.* (11). *So* Athanaſius *ſaw no neceſſity at all of calling in the aſſiſtance of any infallible Guides, to give the certain ſenſe of Scripture in theſe doubtful places.* *Of any infallible Guides*, or of *any* Guides at all, he may ſay; for here are none mentioned, fallible, or infallible. No neceſſity then, of the Council of *Nice*, in *Athanaſius's* judgment? Review the places but now mentioned and ſee more in Note on p. 245. l. 1. This Author hath need of very credulous Readers.

Pag. 230. *l.* 15. *Yet he no where ſaith, that, without the help of that Tradition, it had been impoſſible to have known the certain ſenſe of Scripture.* Nor do *Catholicks* ſay ſo. They ſay only, that the Church Governours, met in a General Council, are infallible in their *deciſions* of neceſſary faith by reaſon of an evident *Tradition* of ſuch an Apoſtolical Doctrine or ſenſe of Scripture deſcending to them: Or by ſome *neceſſary Deduction* of theirs, made from ſuch traditive doctrine in the ſame *neceſſaries*. In the Declaration of both which they are always preſerved from error by the ſuper-intending of the *Divine Providence*, and the aſſiſtance of the *Holy Spirit*. And that, ſuppoſing the *ſenſe* of *Scripture*, without recurrence to ſuch *Tradition*, be cleare enough to ſome, yet that it is not ſo to *all*; who therefore, in their *faith* of ſuch neceſſaries muſt depend on the *authority*, direction, *infallibility*, of their *Guides*. Unleſs our Author will ſay, the *Condition* of *all* Chriſtians is well capable of uſing *all* means poſſible.

Pag. 232. *l.* 5. *The ſame courſe is taken by* Epiphanius, &c. *S. Hilary*, and *S. Epiphanius*, it ſeems, do endeavour to confute Hereticks out of the *Scriptures* What then?

Ib. l. 18. *After the Guides of the Church had in the Council of* Nice *declared what was the Catholick faith; yet ſtill the controverſy was managed about the ſenſe of Scripture and no other ways made uſe of for finding it, than ſuch as we plead for at this day.* Was not the *Decree* of this *Council*, after it held, perpetually by the *Catholicks* urged againſt them? And, if not ſubmitted to by them, the more to blame the *Hereticks* of thoſe days [as now alſo the *Proteſtants* after the 2*d. Nicene*, *Lateraine*, *Florentine*, and *Trent*, Councils] who did not acquieſce in ſuch a juſt authority, as that of

of *Nice*; and (though I think Mr *Chillingworth* would not, yet) will not Dr *St.* as to the *Nicene* Council say the same with me? These then, though denying submission to Councils, yet not to Holy Scriptures, the *Fathers* did in those daies, as *Catholick Doctors* do now, out of *Principles* coneeded by them, and common to both, endeavour to convince them.

Ib. l. (4). *That none of the Catholick Bishops should once suggest this admirable expedient of Infallibility.* Did not these Bishops continually press to them the *consentient Tradition* of the Churches and the Definition of the Council of *Nice*? To what end this, if it acknowledged by them *fallible*? Might an Authority not infallible put their definitions in the *Creed*? and so it remains to this day in the Dr's Creed upon that account. Could it exact belief, and anathematize all Dissenters, and not profess itself *Infallible*?

Pag. 233. *l.* 7. *When they so frequently in Councils contradicted each other.* See this great Friend of *Councils*. Before, ‖ the charge was; *Ancient* Church and Councils contradicting ‖ *p.* 149. those of *latter* times: but now it is grown higher, to the *Ancient* contradicting *Ancient*, without any qualification of Councils held by *Heretick*s contradicting Councils *Catholick*; for, then, the sense had been lost. But, I hope, our Adversary is not yet gone so far, as to affirm any *Council*, *equal* in authority with that of *Nice*, contradicting it: but, if *unequal*, that of *Nice* only will stand in force.

Ib. l. 13. *If the sense of Scripture were in this time to be taken from the Guides of the Church, what security could any man have against Arianism? since the Councils which favoured it were more numerous than those which opposed and condemned it.* *i.e.*; If the sense of the Scripture concerning ὁμοούσιος were to be taken from the Guides of the Church met in the Council of *Nice*, what security, from thence, could we have against Arianisme? since the Arian Councils were more numerous than that of *Nice*, and therefore more obligatory than it? Doth not our Author here a litle too far unmask himself? Doth he hold, then, Christians to owe no obedience to the Definition of the Council of *Nice* against *Arianisme*? Time was when he said ‖ —*We profess to be guided by the sense of Scripture as interpreted by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the four first General Councils,* [will he say here, If these Councils interpret the Scriptures in the *right* sense; *i.e.* in *his*?]. And—*That the Church of* England *looks on it as her duty to keep to the Decrees of the four General Councils*; [and so of *Nice*, the first of them]. Then either the Arian Councils must not be more numerons, as here he affirms, they were: or the more nu- ‖ *Rat. Account, p.* 375.

merous, I mean as to the perſons preſent in it, not always the more valid; which is true. But, if we are now to defend the authority of the *Council* of *Nice* againſt the Dr, we muſt know: that, if he there ſpeaks of the *plurality* of the Arian *Councils*; they many, and that of *Nice* only one: this number is no prejudice to any *one* Council, that is of greater authority: if he ſpeaks of the *plurality* of *Biſhops* in ſome one Arian Council, then, though there were preſent in the *Nicene* Council not above four or five Biſhops from all the *Weſt*, Yet that the whole *Weſt* and all its Biſhops *accepted* it, which they never did any of the *Arian* Councils. Therefore *Athanaſius*, || after thoſe Arian Councils held, ſpeaks thus of that of *Nice*.——*Huic certè concilio univerſus orbis aſſenſum præbuit.* And——*Verbum illud Domini per Oecumenicam* Niceæ *Synodum in æternum manet. Sive enim quis numerum cum numero comparet, tanto major eſt* Nicena *Synodus particularibus Conciliis, quantum totum ſui aliqua parte.* And 2ly. That, had the *Arian* Biſhops throughout the whole world at ſome time outnumbred the *Catholick*, yet theſe after once pronounced *Heretical* by the lawful General Council of *Nice*, were invalidated hereby, (whilſt ſuch), from having any lawful Vote in a future Council: the *Catholick Clergy* and Biſhops remaining a diſtinct Body from them; to whom, and not to them, the Chriſtian world owed its *obedience*.

|| *Epiſt. ad Epiſcop. Affrican.*

|| *Epiſt.* 55. *Ib. l.* (9). *S.* Gregory Nazianzen || *declares he had not ſeen a good iſſue of any one of them*, &c. He ſpake this, of the many *Arian* Councils of his time, ful of faction and ambition, the chief leaders being great *Favorites* to *Conſtantius* an *Heretical* Emperor: Or perhaps, of ſome *Council* alſo held at *Conſtantinople*, wherein he, by ſuch contention amongſt the Biſhops there, ſuffered much: but this he ſaid, excluſively, doubtleſs, both to the *firſt General Council*, that of *Nice*: Of which he ſaith || that——*Patres noſtri, pinſque ille hominum mundus qui* Nicæam *perrexerunt, certis finibus ac verbis Divinitatis doctrinam circumſcripſerunt.* And ——† *Sanctum Concilium* Niceæ *habitum atque illum lectiſſimorum virorum numerum Spiritum Sanctum in unum coegiſſe*: and excluſively again to the 2*d General Council* that of *Conſtantinople*, which he was a member of, and ſubſcribed. What need I now trouble my ſelf or the Reader with vindicating *Bellarmine* on this matter? Meanwhile would not the Dr here have his Reader believe, that this *Father* had a mean eſteem of the *firſt* and *ſecond* General Councils?

|| *Orat. in laud. Hiero.*

† *Orat. in laud. Athanaſ.*

|| *Cont. Maximin. l.*3.*c.*14. *Pag.* 234. *l.* (7) *S.* Auguſtine || *in dealing with* Maximinus *the Arian expreſly ſets aſide all authority of the Guides of the Church as to the ſenſe of Scripture in the places controverted between them.* The

story

Story in brief is this. *Maximinus* an Arian in the beginning of their dispute hath these words——*Si quid de divinis Scripturis protuleris, quod commune est cum omnibus, necesse est ut audiamus. Hæ verò voces quæ extra Scripturam sunt,* [homousion] *nullo casu a nobis suscipiuntur.* [alluding to the definition of *homousion* by the *Nicene* Council]. S. *Augustine* takes his challenge; and, as he waved the Council of *Nice*, so did S. *Augustine* that of *Ariminum*. Upon which here (lib. 3. c. 14.), after he had said——*Hoc est illud* Homousion, *quod in Concilio* Nicæno *adversus Hæreticos Arrianos a Catholicis Patribus veritatis* [i.e, of the Scriptures] *authoritate, & authoritatis* [i.e. by the just authority of a lawfull free General Council] *veritate, firmatum est : quod postea in Concilio* Ariminensi, &c. *multis paucorum fraude deceptis Hæretica impietas labefactare tentavit.* He condescends thus; I say, after this uttered in Justification of *Nice*,——*Sed, nunc, nec ego* Nicænum *nec tu debes* Ariminense, *tanquam præjudicaturus, proferre Concilium. Nec ego hujus authoritate, nec tu illius detineris* [he saith not *tu non teneris*, but *nunc non detineris*] *: Scripturarum authoritatibus, non quorumq; propriis* [as the two Councils were] *sed utrisque communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concenset.* [That is, this our conference or dispute shall only be, as you desire, from *Authorities* of *Scripture*]. Of the sense of which Scripture it is willingly granted, that in many things many persons may be sufficiently certain without the directions of a Guide; but not therefore *all* persons, in *all* points necessary. See before *Note* on p. 230. l. 15. Meanwhile none more than S. *Austin* pleads or vindicates the *Authority* of the Council of *Nice* : needless to be further proved, one would think, to *Dr St.*

Pag. 236. *l.* 1. *This is in terms asserted by him* || *as a fundamental principle, that in those things which are plainly set down in Scripture all things are to be found which concern our faith and rule of life.* S. *Austin* doth not meane, that all things containing our faith or manners are so plainly set down in Scripture as to *all capacities*, that many do not need the direction of an *infallible* Church-authority for settling a certainty of their faith in them ; (a thing affirmed by the *Dr*). To which *infallible Authority*, that this Father referrs such persons for learning the true Faith, see that excellent Treatise of his, *De Utilitate Credendi*, i.e. of believing Church-authority. Where he saith——*Cùm res tanta sit, ut Deus tibi ratione cognoscendus sit, omnes ne putas idoneos?* &c. And——*Tu in eos libros qui Sancti, divinarumque rerum pleni,* &c. *sine duce irruis ?* And——*Omnesne putas idoneos esse percipiendis rationibus quibus, ad divinam intelligentiam, mens ducitur humana? an plures,* || *De Doctrin. Christian. l. 2. c. 9*

an pauc os? paucos, ais, exiſtimo. Quid? cæteris ergò hominibus, qui ingenio tam ſereno præditi non ſunt, negandum Religionem putas? Whom therefore he refers to this ſecurity of believing Church authority. For——*In religione quid iniquius fieri poteſt* (ſaith he ||) *quàm ut Dei Antiſtites nobis non fictum animum pollicentibus credant, nos eis præcipientibus nolimus credere?* And c. 16. that for ſuch perſons---*non eſſe deſperandum, ab eodem ipſo Deo authoritatem aliquam, conſtitutam, quâ, velut gradu certo, innitentes attollamur in Deum. Hanc autem authoritatem ſepoſitâ ratione* (*quam ſinceram intelligere, ut, diximus, difficillimum ſtultis eſt*) *dupliciter nos movere, partim miraculis, partim ſequentium multitudine.* And ||——*Quid eſt aliud ingratum eſſe opi atque auxilio divino quàm tanto labore* [noſtro] *prædictæ authoritati velle reſiſtere?* And *De Baptiſmo* l. 3. c. 14. ——*Fieri poteſt, ut integra teneat verba Symboli* [I may ſay, or of Scripture], *& tamen non rectè credat ſive de ipſâ Trinitate, ſive de Reſurrectione, vel aliquid aliud. Neque enim parva res in ipſâ intus Catholicâ tenere integram fidem, ita ut omnino* (*non de aliquâ creaturâ, ſed*) *de ipſo Deo nihil aliud credat, quàm veritas habet.* And in this book *de Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ l.* 3. *c.* 2. he joines theſe two, the clearer places of Scripture and the authority of the Church, for our learning the Rule of Faith——*Cùm adhibita intentio* (ſaith he) *incertum eſſe providerit, quomodo diſtinguendum aut pronunciandum ſit, conſulat Regulam fidei, quam de Scripturarum planioribus locis, & Eccleſiæ authoritate, percepit.* More of this needs not. Many excellent Rules this Father gives by which to underſtand the Scriptures, *i.e.* for the more *prudent* and *learned*; but not this *excluſively* to *thoſe* perſon's ſubmitting their Judgments to the *Church's authority* who have no *leiſure*, or *parts*, by theſe *Rules* to ſtudy the *Scriptures*; or elſe to other's repairing to it, where any thing in the Scriptures, after their ſtudy, ſtill ſeems to them *obſcure*.

|| *Ibid*

|| *Ib. c.* 17.

|| *S. Auſtin de Doctrin. Chriſtian. l.* 3. *c.* 16.

|| *Jo.* 6. 53.

Pag. 238. *l.* 12. || *Which words* || *ſeeming to command ſomething evil muſt be figuratively underſtood of communicating in the Paſſion of Chriſt, and calling to mind that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.* And not imagining, as the words ſtrictly taken ſound, that our Lords Body and Bloud, in a *carnal* or *natural* and *ſenſible* manner, as other fleſh, is to be eaten and drunk by us; as ſome of our Lords Auditors groſsly mis-underſtood him, and ſo forſook him; in which ſenſe [*Dominus*] *flagitium videtur jubere*, ſaith S. *Auſtin*: Not imagining thus, I ſay; but yet believing that his fleſh and bloud is there *really* exhibited to us, and fed on by us. This *Real*, ſo as alſo ineffable, Preſence of Chriſts *Body* and *Blood* though not to the *Symbols*, yet in the *Euchariſt*, and

ſo

ſo a *reall* participation thereof, the *Church* of *England* and her learnedſt Writers have much ſpoken of, and contended for heretofore, as well as Catholicks, before that the *Rubrick* or *Declaration* about *kneeling in receiving* the *Communion*, was by the importunity of ſome later Sects, admitted a ſecond time into the *Common-Prayer Book*, *A.D.* 1660. Which *Rubrick*, (contrary to the *Real Preſence* in that it denies *that Chriſts ſubſtance can be both in Heaven* [where certainly it is] *and on earth at the ſame time*), was firſt contrived and publiſhed in the 5th year of the Reign of King *Edward* 6. in the new-moulding and correcting of the former *Common Prayer Book* publiſhed in the firſt yeare, upon the Exceptions and complaints of ſome forraign *Reformed Divines* made againſt it, and was then backed alſo with the 28th. Article of Religion under the ſame King in theſe words—*The Body of Chriſt cannot be preſent at one time in many and diverſe places* &c. *and, becauſe it was taken up into heaven* &c. *a faithful man ought not to believe the Reall and Bodily preſence, as they term it, of Chriſts Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lords ſupper:* But, not long after in the beginning of Qu. *Elizabeths* Reign, was thought fit by her Divines, reviewing this 2d Book, to be ejected thence again, as being prejudicial to the foreſaid *Reall Preſence*, (and ſo alſo was the foreſaid clauſe caſt out of the 28th *Article*) of which *Reall Preſence* Queen *Elizabeth* was a great Patroneſſe; And, ſuch a Preſence being confeſſed by *Queen Elizabeth* and her *Clergy*, I hope this Author here will not make to be denied by S. *Auſtin.*]

Pag 239. *l.* (8.) *Whatever conſequences are charged upon me for making that a fundament. l Principle muſt reflect as much upon* S. Auſtin, *as me.* See the contrary, *Note* on p. 236. l. 1.

Pag. 240. *l.* 4. *Who* [Vincentius Lerinenſis] *ſeems to attribute more to the Guides of the Church than* S. Auſtin *doth, yet far enough ſhort of Infallibility.* Now we muſt follow our Author to *Vincentius Lerinenſis*. As for this Father, firſt, he held in all ages the exiſtence and being of a *Catholick* Church, diſtinct from others, if any *Heretical*, how numerous ſoever they might be: in which Catholick Church was preſerved entire the Catholick Doctrine, eſpecially in all *Neceſſaries*; and, if ſo, therefore a Church in whatever age always *conſentient* with *Antiquity*: So that *Univerſalitas*, as to the conſent of the Catholicks of any age, and *Antiquitas* can never be ſevered. 2ly. He held the *Decrees* of the *Councils* of this Catholick Church in *whatever times* convened to be true and never to ſwerve from the *Apoſtolical* doctrine, *i.e.* to be *infallible*, and that all were to receive and obey them; and all diſſenters from them to be Hereticks. To this purpoſe he ſaith.

C. 33.

c. 33. on that text 2. *Jo.* 10. *Si quis venit ad vos & hanc doctrinam non affert nolite recipere eum in domum, nec Ave ei dixeritis. Quam doctrinam?* ſaith he, *niſi Catholicam & univerſalem & unam eandemque per ſingulas ætatum ſucceſſiones incorruptâ veritatis traditione manentem, & uſque in ſæcula ſine fine manſuram?* And, c. 24. *Profanes vocum novitates devita, quas recipere atque ſectari, nunquam Catholicorum, ſemper verò Hæreticorum, fuit.* And c. 32. he deſcribes the Catholick Church thus, *i.e.* the Eccleſiaſtical Governours and Prelates thereof——*Chriſti verò Eccleſia, ſedula & cauta depoſitorum apud ſe dogmatum cuſtos, nihil in iis unquam permutat, nihil minuit, nihil addit——Hoc unum ſtudet, ut, quæ jam expreſſa & enucleata, conſolidet, firmet; ſiqua jam confirmata & definita, cuſtodiat. Denique quid unquam aliud Conciliorum decretis eniſa eſt, niſi ut, quid antea ſimpliciter credebatur, hoc idem poſtea diligentius crederetur?——quod prius a majoribus ſolâ traditione ſuſceperat, hoc deinde poſteris etiam per Scripturæ chirographum conſignaret.* He ſaith c. 35. that the Hereticks, ancient, modern, urged the teſtimony of Scripture——*Propè nullam omitti paginam, quæ non novi aut veteris Teſtamenti ſententiis fucata & colorata ſit.* And c. 2.——*Multum neceſſe eſſe, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut Propheticæ & Apoſtolicæ interpretationis linea ſecundum Eccleſiaſtici & Catholici ſenſus normam dirigatur.* [Where I ask; did the Father think this fallible?]. And c. 41. he ſaith——*Duo quædam vehementer ſtudioſeque obſervanda:——Primùm ſi quid eſſet antiquitùs ab omnibus Eccleſiæ Catholicæ ſacerdotibus Univerſalis Concilii auctoritate decretum: Deinde ſiqua nova exurgeret quæſtio, ubi id minimè reperiretur, recurrendum ad Sanctorum Patrum ſententias——Et quicquid uno ſenſu atque conſenſu tenuiſſe invenirentur, id Eccleſiæ verum & Catholicum abſque ullo ſcrupulo judicaretur.* c. 40. Deſcanting on 1. *Cor.* 12. 28. He ſaith of the Church-Governours——*Hos ergo in Eccleſiâ Dei divinitùs per tempora & loca diſpenſatos quiſquis in ſenſu Catholici dogmatis unum aliquid in Chriſto ſentientes contemſerit, non hominem contemnit, ſed Deum: a quorum veridicâ unitate nequid diſcrepet, impenſiùs obteſtatur idem Apoſtolus, dicens: Obſecro autem vos fratres ut idipſum dicatis omnes, & non ſint in vobis ſchiſmata: ſitis autem perfecti in eodem ſenſu, & in eadem ſententiâ* [i.e. of theſe Church-Guides *unum aliquid in Chriſto ſententium*] *Quod ſi quis ab eorum ſententiæ communione deſciverit audiet illud ejuſdem Apoſtoli: Non eſt Deus diſſenſionis, ſed Pacis.* And c. 42. after he had made an inſtance in the 3d *General Council*, (but a little before his writing this *Commonitorium*), its ſettling the faith in the points then controverted, he joines to it in the laſt place the Authority of the *See Apoſtolical*——*Nequid*, ſaith he, *deeſſe tantæ plenitudini videretur*,

deretur, ad poſtremum adjecimus geminam Apoſtolicæ Sedis *auctoritatem: unam ſcilicet Sancti Papæ* Xysti *qui nunc* Romanam *Eccleſiam venerandus illuſtrat: alteram prædeceſſoris ſui beatæ memoriæ Papæ* Cæleſtini, *quam hic quoque interponere neceſſariam judicavimus.* Let the Reader by this judge now, whether *Lerinenſis* hath ſaid nothing for Church-Infallibility.

Pag. 241. *l.* 3. *Univerſality in any one age of the Church being taken without the conſent of Antiquity, is no ſufficient rule to interpret Scripture by.* It is true, *Univerſality* departing from, or contrary to, *Antiquity*, is no ſufficient *Rule* to interpret Scripture by. But *Vincentius*, as I have ſhewed, holds the *Univerſality* of the *Catholick* Church in any age never to do ſo, eſpecially in any Neceſſaries. And, if *Arians* in any time out-numbred Catholicks (which they never did, taking in both Eaſt and Weſt) yet ſtill the *whole* Body of them was *extra-Catholick*, being formerly condemned of Hereſy by a General Council: & ||——*Tunc quiſquis verus Chriſti amator & cultor extitit, antiquam fidem novellæ perfidiæ præferendo, nulla contagie iſtius peſtis maculatus eſt.* Here then was in all *Arian* times a *Catholick* Body (ſuppoſe leſſer) conſentient with *Antiquity*, and ſafely to be relied on in its Decrees. But here, whenever this comes in queſtion; Whether the *preſent Univerſality* diſſents from Antiquity, whoſe judgment ſhould be ſooner taken, than its own; rather than that of thoſe few who oppoſe it; for, both are Parties? and, if its owne; when can we think, it will witneſs its *departure* from the *former Faith?* || *cap.* 6.

Ib. l. 15. *In ſome caſes the univerſal conſent of the preſent Church is to be relied upon,* &c. *as in that of the* Donatists. *Univerſal conſent* of *preſent* Churches in any age, ſo this be limited to Churches *Catholick*, contradiſtinct to *Hereticks* or thoſe condemned by former Councils, can never falſify former Church-Tradition. *Quod ab omnibus*, I mean in any one age underſtood of the *Catholick* Church, and in matters of *faith*, is always, *quod ſemper* too. All Hereticks alſo at firſt are only a *ſmal* number, and their innovation eaſily diſcerned. Therefore the *univerſality* of the *preſent* age was pleaded by S. *Auſtin* in his age againſt the *Donatiſts*, from Scriptures that prove the ſame as much in *any* age whatever: Nor is this *preſent* Church's conſent with Antiquity mentioned in S. *Auſtins* arguing as if it were not to be credited without this conſent alſo of *Antiquity* firſt proved by it; for, the one, as is ſaid, in matter of faith always involves the other.

Pag. 242. *l.* 1. *That the Church in any one or more ages ſince the Apoſtles times may be deceived.* *The Church*, means he the univerſality of the Catholick Church? *may be deceived*, means

means he in points of *neceſſary* faith, or in the Tradition of them? This is denied.

Ib. l. 15. *But ſince the great diviſions of the Chriſtian world, it is both a very hard matter to know the conſent*, &c. 1. *The name of Catholick Church now is not* (as he ſaith) *that of one great faction*; but contains in it now, as always, *all* Chriſtian Churches that are united in obedience to all their lawful and Canonical *Eccleſiaſtical Superiours*, Perſons, or Councils; i.e. *all* that are not *Heretical* or *Schiſmatical*. 2. *The Notion alſo of Univerſality is not* (as he ſaith) *now debauched and corrupted*; but taken now, as anciently in the firſt 4. General Councils, for the *much major* part, to whom the reſt ought to conform——*Turpis omnis pars non conſentiens toti*. And, as it is alſo taken in *Vincentius*, whether applyed to the *preſent*, or *ancient*, times; ſee c. 38.——*Si quando unius vel paucorum errantium diſſenſio contra omnium vel certe multo plurium Catholicorum conſenſionem rebellaverit &c.* And c 4——*Quod ſi in ipſâ vetuſtate duorum vel trium hominum, vel certè Civitatis unius aut etiam Provinciæ error deprehendatur*, &c. For, there muſt be no *Heretick*; if, no *diſſenters*. The *univerſal conſent* of Chriſtendome (Univerſality thus qualified) is eaſily known concerning moſt of the modern Controverſies: ſuppoſe, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images*, *Prayer for the Dead*, &c. And to them only the knowledge of this *ſeems difficult*, whom, it favours not.

Ib. l. (2). *There are ſome things wherein we may be certain of ſuch a conſent* [viz. of Antiquity], *and that was in the Rule of Faith.* *Vincentius* reſtrains not that application of his *Rule* only to the *Symbole* or Rule of *Faith* formerly delivered in *Baptiſme*. So it would not extend to the *Decrees* of the *Epheſine* Council, which he inſtanceth in to have followed this *Rule*; and little uſe would there be of this *Rule* againſt *Heretick*s, if extended no further: But enlargeth it to all the Faith wherein General Councils have or ſhall make any *Decrees*. And the *evidence* of Tradition may be equal in matters as of an unequal, ſo all of ſome, conſequence.

Pag. 243. *l.* 11. *For ſaith he, this conſent of Antiquity is not to be ſought for in all queſtions.* It may be ſought for wherever it can be found: but in many *Quæſtiuncula*, as he cals them, it is not to be *found*.

Pag. 244. *l.* 12. *Let the Pope's Supremacy, the* Roman [he ſhould ſay, *Catholick*] *Church's Infallibility, the doctrines of Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory*, &c. *be proved by as univerſal conſent of Antiquity, as the Articles of the Creed are, and then let them charge*

charge us with Heresy if we reject them. 1st. The former *Councils* that have defined these points can also prove them by *Antiquity*, *Universality*, *Consent*, taken in such a latitude, as is necessary and sufficient. *Consent*, &c either in the *Tradition* of the thing defined, or of the *Principles* from which it is deduced. But here, it is not necessary that the *same* extent or latitude of Consent, *&c* should be shewed for *all* points of faith: Not necessary, that there be no more Bishops found dissenting in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, establishing *Two Natures* of our *Lord*, than were in the *Council* of *Nice*, establishing his *Divinity*. And, of the Ancient Creeds *some* points have had a more universal consent, than some *others*. 2. And next, this Query, when there is a sufficient universality of such Consent or such Tradition, I know not whose judgment the most of Christians, who are *unlearned*, can better trust and rely on, than that of the Supreme Guides of the *present Church* so informing them. 3ly That these Councils should first *prove* or evidence such an universal *Attestation* to every one before they can require a submission of their judgment to their definitions, as it is an unreasonable demand, so it is rejected by several learned *Protestant* Divines (when *obedience* hath been offered, by other *Sects* to the *Canons* and *Articles* of the Church of *England* upon these terms of *proving* them to them first) who think it enough if such submission be then released, when private men *demonstrate* the contrary. 4. Lastly, What judgment can *illiterate* persons make of what is thus proved, or not proved to them? And, if *Obedience* must pass only upon such *proof* to their *subjects*, these also judging when this rightly made, what confusion and licentiousness of Opinions and Practice must this introduce necessarily in such *Churches* as maintain it?

Ib. l. 18. *We say, the measure of Heresy in the ancient Church was the rejecting the Rule of faith universally received.* And such it is still: all persons learning from General Councils, not only from the definitions of the *ancient*, but *latter*, Councils, what is this *Rule* universally received. And the same Plea our Author can make against any *latter* definitions of Councils in matters of faith, upon their not being expressed in the former *Creeds*, *Arius*, *Nestorius*, or *Eutyches*, might make as justly against those of the 4. *first Councils* not expressed in the former Creed or *Rule of faith* delivered at Baptisme. Which first Rule only *Vincentius* therefore did not relate to, since he contends, this *Rule* is extended to the *Decrees* also of these Councils.

Pag. 245. *l.* 14. *And yet he* [Petavius] *confesseth, that most of the writers of the ancient Church did differ in their explication of*

the Doctrine of the Trinity from that which was only allowed by the Council of Nice, *and he grants that* Arius *did follow the Opinion of many of the Ancients in the main of his Doctrine.* Petavius, after the words cited by this Author *multum a nobis diverſa ſcripſerunt*, expounds this *diverſa* to be only *in modo loquendi*. And the next words in him are——*Pauciſſimi illi ſunt* [ſpeaking of the ancient Writers before *Nice*] *qui in re diſſentiunt a communi fide: & ſi ſinceros puroſque Catholicos quærimus, omnino nulli.* There, among thoſe, *qui in omnibus re conſentientes, loquendi duntaxat modo diſſident*, he numbers *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Gregory Neocæſarienſis*, *Methodius*, and others: and, of the other, *qui ſubſtantiam Dogmatis* [of the Trinity] *tenentes, in conſectariis quibuſdam non nihil a Regulâ deflectunt*, he numbers only three, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, and *Theophylus Antiochenus* Præfat. c. 3. he ſaith alſo——*Longè plures extiterunt, quibus aut ſcripto comprehenſa, aut ſine ſcripto prædicata, fidei veritas permanavit ad poſteros.* All is repreſented here contrary: what truſt may his Reader repoſe upon this Author's Citations? Or what great regard ſeems he to have of the Credit of the *Fathers*, or of the ſecurity of *Tradition*, (on which the Ancient Writers, cited before, lay ſo great weight for conviction of *Hereticks*), even in the Delivering the Doctrine of the *Trinity*? Whilſt he writes here on this manner to weaken both.——*The uſefulneſs of Tradition, I am told, is for explaining the ſenſe of Scripture: But there begins a great Controverſy in the Church about the explication of the Doctrine of the* Trinity; *I deſire to know whether* Vincentius *his Rules will help us here? It is pleaded by S.* Hierome *and others*, That the Writers of the Church might err in this matter, or ſpeak unwarily in it before the matter came to be throughly diſcuſſed: *if ſo, how comes the Teſtimony of* erroneous *or* unwary Writers *to be the* certain means *of giving the* ſenſe *of* Scripture? *And in moſt of the Controverſies of the Church this way hath been uſed to take off the teſtimony of perſons, who writ before the Controverſy began, and ſpake differently of the matter in debate. I do not deny the truth of the allegation in behalf of thoſe perſons; but to my underſtanding it plainly ſhews the incompetency of Tradition for giving a certain ſenſe of Scripture, when that Tradition is to be taken from the Writers of the foregoing Ages: and if this had been the only way of confuting* Arius, *it is a great Queſtion how he could ever have been condemned, if* Petavius *or S.* Hierom *ſay true.* Thus this Dr. *Ib. l.* (2.) *It is pleaded by S.* Hierome *and others, that the Writers of the Church might err in this matter, or ſpeak unwarily* &c.

Dogm. Theol. l. 2.

The Writers: Our Author deals much in *indefinite* [i.e. doubtful] terms. S. *Jerome* ſpeaks only of thoſe few *Ancients* quoted by

by *Ruffinus*: Of which Ancients too, *Origen* is cited by S. *Athanasius* † for the orthodox opinion: and apologized for, that—*Quæ disputandi certandique gratiâ scripsit, ea non quasi ipsius sint verba, aut quasi ipse ita sentiat, sed eorum, qui cum eo contentiosius disputarunt, accipienda sunt.* And also, the most considerable of them, *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, is amply vindicated by him, writing a *Treatise* of it. And some of the rest possibly may be defended on the same account as *Dionysius*: who, then opposing *Sabellianisme* a contrary Heresy to *Arianisme*, had occasion to speak in vindication of our *Lord's Humanity*; and might have their sense mistaken. But, however, the errour of some may well consist with the Notion of *Universality* as taken by *Vincentius*; and, whilst some ancient Writers happen to be either unwary in their expression; or also faulty in their opinion, the certain sense of the *Scriptures* may be learnt from others, more *numerous*; and not only from the *Writers*, which in the *three* first *Ages* were but few, but from the general Doctrine of the other *Church-Prelates*. And so it was learnt by the *Council* of *Nice*; which pleaded the constant *Tradition* of the *former* times for the doctrine they defined. See *Athanasius* in his Epistle to the *Africans* for the very *expressions* used by the *Council*—*Neque* (saith he) *hâc in parte sibi ista vocabula finxerunt, sed a Patribus, qui ante fuerunt, ea didicerunt, quemadmodum diximus*; and a little before mentions *Eusebius Nicomediensis* the ring-leader of the Arians confessing it. Again Ibid—*Sufficit Nicæna, quæ cum veteribus Episcopis consentit.* And—*Si, post tot documenta, postque testimonia veterum Episcoporum* &c. Again in his Tract. de Synod. Nic. Decretis—*Est ibi* (saith he), *ut Patres tradiderunt, vera disciplinæ & magistri argumentum, ubi eadem confitentur, nec a se invicem, nec a majoribus dissentiunt.*—*Qui* (saith he shewing the constancy of Tradition) *tametsi diversis temporibus vixerint, æquè tamen simul eodem tendunt, ut unius Dei propheta, & ejusdem sermonis interpretes. Quæ enim Moses docuit, eadem ab Abrahamo observata sunt, quæ porrò Abraham observavit eadem Noe & Enoch agnoverunt*; urging *Gal.* 1. 8. *Si quis vobis evangelizaverit præter hoc, quod accepistis, anathema sit.* And afterward contends—*Patres, qui Nicæ convenerunt, non a se hæc vocabula finxisse, sed ab aliis olim accepisse*, quoting there several of the Ancients, and among the rest *Origen* and *Dionysius Alexandrinus*; concluding thus—*Ecce nos demonstramus istiusmodi sententiam a Patribus ad Patres quasi per manus traditam esse.* But lastly; in a *Tradition* any way less evident as to the *universality* thereof in former Writers, yet we are secure of these *Supreme* Church-Governours assembled their not defining an *errour* in Faith *necessary*, both from the light

† *De Synod. Nicæn. Decretis.*

they may have from *Scriptures*, always principally conſulted by them as the chief of *Traditions*; and, where their learning and practice therein may diſcern that clear, which is obſcure to others; and from our Lords *promiſed aſſiſtance* of them with his *Holy Spirit*; of which we have a moſt clear and evident *Tradition*. Meanwhile, is not *Vincentius* his *Rule* by this Authors diſcourſe here made unſerviceable in one of the chief points, wherein *Vincentius* againſt the *Hereticks* relied on the *evidence* of former *Tradition*? *i.e.* in the *Divinity* of our *Lord*? And is not the Dr, for ſtrengthening the Proteſtant cauſe, in ſome manner become an Advocate for the *Arian*? Let the Reader review it.

Pag, 246. *l*. 17. *And, if this* [The Tradition of foregoing ages] *had been the only way of confuting* Arius, *it is a great queſtion how he could ever have been condemned, if* Petavius *or S*. Hierome *ſay true*. I think the Reader hath ſeen what little countenance our Author hath had from theſe two; whilſt he would here inſinuate to his Reader, that the former written Church Tradition was either on *Arius* his ſide, or not againſt him. What ſtone will not a contrary intereſt turn, to unhx or diſhonour our Holy Mother the Church?

Pag. 247. *l*. 5. *And in this regard we acknowledge a great reverence due to the decrees of ſuch General Councils as that was. Acknowledge a great Reverence due*, But *Quære*, Whether yield *aſſent* and Submiſſion of *Judgment* to all, that all ſuch *lawful General Councils* do, or ſhall, define? And, if ſo, upon what account can this be, ſave on the evidence that Scripture and Tradition yields of their perpetual aſſiſtance from our Lord in *neceſſaries* not to miſtake either the *ſenſe* of Scripture or *truth* of Tradition ſo, as to convey a wrong one to poſterity. If we do not reverence them on this manner, and that our obedience be yielded only to what they ſhall firſt *prove* to us, the *Arian*, where he thinks nothing *proved* to him (for, of this he is to judge), is as *innocent* in diſſenting, as we in aſſenting.

Ib. *l*. (9) *Vincentius Lerinenſis* his words —*What either all the Fathers or many of them manifeſtly frequently and conſtantly, as it were by a Council of them, have confirmed by their receiving, holding, and delivering of it, that ought to be held for undoubted, certain and firm. Undoubted, certain and firm*: Upon what account? Surely, on the *Infallibility* of ſomething, whatever it is: and this not of *Scripture*, the *ſenſe* of which is here conteſted.

Pag. 248. *l*. (7). *He ſaith, we have no way to deal with them but either only by Scripture, or elſe by plain Decrees of General Councils*. By theſe decrees then *Vincentius*, at laſt, hath left us

us to diſcern *Hereſies*: I would this Authour would do ſo too.

Pag. 249. *l.* 7. *And very far from the leaſt ſuppoſition of Infallibility.* Not ſo ſurely; if our Author remember *Vincentius* his former words affirming ſuch Infallibility to be in General Councils, as that what is delivered by them *ought to be held for undoubted, certain, and firm.* And we require no more.

Ib. l. (2). *If ancient General Councils have determined it, which had greater opportunities of knowing the ſenſe of the Apoſtolical Church than we, it is reaſonable, we ſhould yield to them. Which had greater opportunities of knowing the ſenſe*, &c. But, what if latter General Councils of latter ages have determined any thing, ſhould we not *yield* to *them* alſo? for, theſe times alſo are nearer to the *Apoſtles* than the *preſent*? And if *eight hundred* or a *thouſand* years be thought by him too great a diſtance for deciding ſuch matters, why may not an *Eutychian* think ſo of *four hundred*? *It is reaſonable we ſhould yield to them.* He ſaith not, *what*; Means he, yield our *Aſſent*? No more is deſired, but that this be yielded to all lawful General Councils in what age ſoever; which *Councils* may be in any age *neceſſary*, and in any age are of an *equall* authority, and equally *Judges* of the ſenſe of Scripture and former Tradition. The *Council* of *Nice* was ſubmitted to by the Chriſtians of that age, though a Council held in *their own* times. He goes on.

Pag. 250. *l.* 3. *But if there have been none ſuch, then the unanimous conſent of Fathers is to be taken.* Page 197. the enquiry was about the means uſed by the *Ancients* of attaining the certain ſenſe of Scripture in *doubtful* places without the ſuppoſition of an *Infallible* Guide; the reſolution here is; that where, after examining and comparing places of Scripture, the diſpute ſtill remains concerning the certain ſenſe thereof, that we are to acquieſce in the *Decree*, of a lawful *General Council*, if any ſuch have been concerning it; or, if not, in the *unanimous Conſent* of *Fathers*. I ask; and are not thoſe recommended by theſe Ancients as *Certain* and *Infallible* in ſuch matter that is Decreed or Conſented in: ſuppoſe in the matter of our *Lord's Divinity*, wherein the *ſenſe* of *Scripture* was diſputed by the *Arians* and *Anti-Arians*? But then, concerning this unanimous Conſent of the Fathers, ſince the illiterate cannot examine this, whom are they to rely on, but on the Conſent of the *preſent Church*?

Ib. l. 13. *If all theſe meanes were ſufficient, then there is no neceſſity of infallibility in the Guides of the Church.* One *Exception* is here to be put in, *Viz.* Unleſs *N. O.* will call the *Teſtimony* of *General Councils* delivering a certain ſenſe of Scripture,

Scripture, or the *unanimous Conſent* of *Catholick* Churches (which the Ancient Authors, this Author hath quoted, do maintain to be firm, certain, and free from doubt) an *Infallibility* in the Guides of the Church; as he doth. So that it ſeems to follow juſt contrary to our Author. If theſe *Means* are preſcribed by the Fathers, then there is a neceſſity of an *Infallibility* in the *Church-Guides*. Annotations on §. 14. S. *Auſtins* Teſtimony examined.

Annotations on §. 14. S. Auſtins Teſtimony examined.

Pag. 250. *l.* (11). *Infallibility in delivering the ſenſe of Scripture in obſcure places.* Add, In points *neceſſary*.

Pag. 251. *l.* (12.) S. Auſtin *doth not ſuppoſe that man cannot attain to any certainty of the ſenſe of Scripture in this matter* [concerning Rebaptization] *without the Church's Infallibility; for he ſaith in the Chapter preceding, that in this matter we follow the moſt certain Authority of Canonical Scriptures.* But S. *Auſtin* ‖ declares his meaning in the next words to be only this. *Viz.*——*Quia hoc per univerſam Catholicam obſervari placuit, quod tenemus:* which he proceeds to explain further in the words following, cited by *N.O.*——*Quam vis hujus rei* [i.e. concerning Non-Rebaptization] *certè de Scripturis Canonicis non proferatur exemplum, earundem tamen Scripturarum etiam in hâc re à nobis tenetur veritas, cùm hoc facimus quod univerſæ jam placuit Eccleſiæ, quam ipſarum Scripturarum commendat authoritas: ut quoniam Sancta Scriptura fallere non poteſt quiſquis falli metuit hujus obſcuritate quæſtionis* [not cleared in Scriptures] *eandem Eccleſiam de illâ conſulat.* And, what the Father ſaith here of our retaining the *verity* and *authority* of *Scriptures* in our obeying the Decrees and Reſolutions of the *Church*, to which Church we are referred by them; the ſame ſaith he elſwhere ‖ concerning our obeying the authority and verity of *Chriſt*, when *Chriſt* alſo referrs us to the guidance of his Church; in theſe words——*Dicat mihi nunc hæreticus: Quomodo me ſuſcipis? Citò reſpondeo: ſicut ſuſcipit Eccleſia, cui Chriſtus perhibet teſtimonium. Nunquid tu melius potes noſſe quomodo ſuſcipiendus ſis, quàm Salvator noſter medicus vulneris tui? Hic fortè dicis: Lege ergo mihi quemadmodum Chriſtus ſuſcipi juſſerit eos, qui ab hæreticis tranſire ad Eccleſiam volunt. Hoc apertè atque evidenter, nec ego lego, nec tu* [i.e. in the Scriptures]. [Here, we ſee, is neither example, nor any other plain direction in the *Scripture*, or from our *Lord* himſelf concerning this matter. He goes on]. ——*Nunc verò cùm in Scripturis non inve-*

‖ *Cont. Creſcon. l. 1. c. 32 N. 1.*

‖ *De Unita. Eccleſ. c. 22.*

inveniamus aliquos ad eccleſiam tranſiſſe ab hæreticis, & ſicut ego dico, aut ſicut tu dicis, eſſe ſuſceptos, puto ſi aliquis ſapiens extitiſſet, cui Dominus Jeſus Chriſtus teſtimonium perhibet, & de hâc quæſtione conſuleretur à nobis, nullo modo dubitare deberemus id facere quod ille dixiſſet; ne non tam ipſi, quàm Domino Jeſu Chriſto, *cujus teſtimonio commendabatur, repugnare judicaremur. Perhibet autem teſtimonium Chriſtus Eccleſiæ ſuæ.——Quomodo ergo ſuſcipit iſta Eccleſia per omnes gentes incipientibus ab Hieruſalem, remotis omnibus ambagibus & tergiverſationibus, ſic ſuſcipiendus es. Quod ſi non vis, non mihi, aut cuiquam hominum, qui vult ita ſuſcipere, ſed ipſi Salvatori contra ſalutem tuam perniciosiſſimè reluctaris; cui te ſic ſuſcipiendum eſſe non vis credere, quemadmodum ſuſcipit illa Eccleſia, quam teſtimonio ſuo commendat ille, cui fateris nefarium eſſe non credere.* Here this Father plainly ſaith, in believing and doing as the *Church* commands and directs us, we believe and do that which *our Lord* and the *Scriptures* command us; which Lord aud Scriptures have commended and given a Teſtimony to us of his Church.

Which recommendation and Teſtimony let it be meant as the Dr will have it, namely of the ſhewing and pointing out, *which*, of ſeveral pretending to be it, is this *Catholick* Church: for, indeed this thing only needed a proof to the *Donatiſts*, who allowed the ſame *Infallibility* in this *Catholick* Church as S. *Auſtin*, and ſo an Infallibility in themſelves, conceiving themſelves only to be this Catholick Church, and that which our *Lord* and the Scriptures ſo recommended. Yet this Church, thus demonſtrated *which* it is, it is manifeſt S. *Auſtin* in the former paſſages affirms that in all things we are to follow, and believe to be truth, that which it tells us is ſo, as if *Chriſt*, or the *Scriptures*, that recommended this Church to us, had told us ſo. Otherwiſe if this *Church*, ſo demonſtrated by our Lord and Scripture, be *fallible*, after its *Reſolution* we may ſtill be deceived in our Queſtion about *Rebaptization*, [whereas the Father ſaith——*Quiſquis falli metuit &c. Eccleſiam conſulat*: and,——*Scripturarum a nobis tenetur veritas, cùm hoc facimus quod univerſæ placuit Eccleſiæ*], And ſo, after ſuch *Reſolution*, we may disbelieve the *Church*, without disbelieving our *Lord*. *Nor* can S *Auſtin* juſtly ſay, as he doth, to a *Donatiſt* refuſing to receive Hereticks ſo as the Church doth without *Rebaptization*——*Nunquid Tu melius potes noſſe quomodo ſuſcipiendus ſis, quàm Salvator noſter*? And here it would be a great miſtake to rely on the *Church* for that which it delivers to us as a truth upon our Lord's *recommending* it, which Church our Lord *recommends* not for this, but ſome *other* thing conſiſtent with that, which it delivers, its being an *error*. N. 2.

But

N. 3. But, to put this further out of doubt. If S. *Austin* did not suppose our Lord and the Scriptures to recommend this Church in such doubtful cases, as, in its Resolutions of them, Infallible, how comes this Father to require *Assent* and *belief* of what this Church defines, and *doing* of what she commands? How makes he all Hereticks, that dissent from her Definitions? even those *Donatists* to be *Hereticks*, after the Church's Decree, for holding Rebaptization, who were not so, before it? Now, *Hæresis, quæ in vitio est*, as he saith, ‖ *sine errore aliquo Hæresis esse non potest*. But, if General Councils might erre in such points, something thus might be *Heresy* in opposing them, that were no *errour*. If he held not Non-*rebaptization* defined by the Church as a most certain truth, how came it to be put in the *Creed*? May something be a part of the Christian Faith, that is not truth? S. *Austin* every where expresseth his belief touching the not erring of General Councils otherwise. See concerning Non-rebaptization *De Baptismo* 2.*l.* 4.c. where he questions not S. *Cyprian's* yielding to the *consenting* authority of the *universal* Church on this account——*Si jam illo tempore quæstionis hujus veritas eliquata & declarata per plenarium Concilium solidaretur*; Therefore S. *Austin* held it was so consolidated afterward. So he saith of him Ib.c.8.——*Ut, quod postea plenario Concilio visum est id verum esse perspiceret & doceret*. But how this his discerning it and teaching it for truth, if this Council might erre in their definition of it? He might indeed have expected S. *Cyprian's* conserving the Church's *peace*, but not conforming to its *opinion*. He cals the Council's Decree *verum & liquidum : eliquatum & sincerum*. Aud 2.l 1.c. he calls it after defined *regula veritatis, quam tota ecclesia tenuit*. *L.*1.*c.* 18. he saith——*Restat ut hoc credamus, quod universa ecclesia custodit*. And——*Quod in hâc re sentiendum est, plenioris Concilii sententiâ totius Ecclesiæ consensio confirmat*. Lib. *de Hæresibus* he saith of the *Donatists*——*Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos; ubi se amplius Hæreticos esse firmarunt, cum ecclesiæ Catholicæ universæ placuerit nec in ipsis Hæreticis Baptisma commune rescindere*. And Ibid. he saith that——*Sufficit Ecclesiam contra aliquid sentire, ut illud non recipiamus in fidem :* Why so, if something in matters of Faith, contrary to what the Church believes, may be *Truth?* And, if the *Father* saith thus of this Church, *cui testimonium perhibet Christus & Scriptura*, its not erring in *Quæstione obscurissimâ* as he calls it, and having no clear evidence of Scripture; what would he do, in its defining any other points wherein the Scriptures afford the same *Church* more *light*?

‖ *De Hæresibus.*

N. 4. To this Church, he applies that Text 1. *Tim.* 3. 15, 16. ——*Ut scias quomodo oporteat te in domo Dei conversari, quæ est Ecclesia*

Eccleſia Dei vivi, columna & firmamentum veritatis. And *Magnum eſt pietatis ſacramentum---prædicatum eſt in gentibus, creditum eſt in mundo.* And † ſpeaking againſt the *Pelagians* concerning another point already defined by the Church——*Eccleſiæ ſanctæ* (ſaith he), *pro remiſſione peccati Originalis parvulorum quotidiè laboranti, non contradicant. Fundata iſta res eſt* [i.e. the benefit of Baptiſme to Infants]. *Ferendus eſt diſputator errans in altis quæſtionibus, non diligenter digeſtis, nondum plenâ Eccleſiæ authoritate firmatis; ibi ferendus eſt error: non tantum progredi debet, ut etiam fundamentum ipſum Eccleſia quatere moliatur.* So ſaith he *Contra Parmenian. l.2. c.13.*——*De iis, qui ab Eccleſiæ unitate ſeparati ſunt nulla jam quæſtio eſt, quin & habeant* [verum Baptiſmum] *& dare poſſint. Hoc enim in ipſo totius orbis unitate diſcuſſum, conſideratum, perfectum atque firmatum eſt.* And to this might be added all thoſe Teſtimonies out of him, wherein he ſaith, that there can never be any *juſt* cauſe of ſeparating from the *Communion* of the *Catholick Church*; from which I conceive it follows, that ſhe can never commit ſuch an errour in her Decrees, that, to avoid the ſubſcription thereof exacted by her, any ſhall be juſtly neceſſitated to leave her *external Communion*.

|| *De Unit. Eccleſ. c.2.*

† *De Verbis Apoſtoli, Serm.14.*

Concerning the ſame *Church's Authority* he ſaith in his Book *De Utilitate Credendi c.* 16.——*Homini non valenti verum intueri——Authoritas ab ipſo Deo conſtituta præſto eſt---quo velut gradu certo innitentes attollamur ad Deum.* And c. 17.——*Quid eſt aliud ingratum eſſe opi auxilioque Divino quam prædictæ* authoritati *velle reſiſtere?* In reſpect of which Authority he ſaith that——*In* Catholica Eccleſia *there is* ſinceriſſima ſapientia, *which alſo he defines* adhæſio veritati. And——*Turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, ſed credendi ſimplicitas tutiſſimam facit.* Ibid. he ſaith, he believes the Goſpel from this Authority of the Catholick Church——*Quâ* [authoritate Catholicorum] *infirmatâ, jam nec Evangelio credere potero quia per eos illi credideram.* Of which ſee more in his 11.l. *Cont. Fauſtum, c.* 2, &c.

N. 5.

Contra Epiſt. Manich. c. 4.

And the *Motives*, he ſaith, that induced him to credit and follow ſuch *Authority*, are ſuch as theſe (urged by *N.O.* ||) Ibid. Beſides the Wiſdome he obſerved in the Church——*Tenet me* (ſaith he) *conſenſio populorum atque gentium; tenet authoritas miraculis inchoata, ſpe nutrita, charitate aucta, vetuſtate firmata: tenet ab ipſâ* Sede Petri Apoſtoli, *cui paſcendas oves ſuas poſt Reſurrectionem Dominus commendavit, uſque ad præſentem Epiſcopatum ſucceſſio Sacerdotum* &c. Where we may obſerve him, as alſo *Irenaus, Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*, giving a ſpecial *Principality*, amongſt other Churches, to that of *Rome*; for which likewiſe he

N. 6.

|| *p.87.*

cites that Text *Jo.* 21. 15. of our Lord's giving a ſpecial charge to S. *Peter* of *feeding his Sheep* (which ſpecial Commiſſion of our Lord to *Peter* alſo S. *Paul* ſeems to relate to *Gal.* 2. 8. where he ſaith the Apoſtleſhip of the Circumciſion was given [not to all the Apoſtles,] but to *Peter*): and ſo this Father, in his 162. Epiſtle againſt the *Donatiſts*, naming this *See* amongſt others with whom *Cæcilianus* was joined in communion, he ſaith——*In quâ* [*Eccleſiâ Romanâ*] *ſemper* Apoſtolicæ Cathedræ *viguit Principatus*]. Again in his Book *De Utilit. Credendi* ſpeaking of the ſame Church Authority——*Hâc autem* (ſaith he) *ſepoſitâ ratione duplicitèr nos movet partim miraculis, partim ſequentium multitudine.*
c. 14. And——*Hoc ergo credidi famæ celebritate, conſenſione vetuſtate roborata.* And——*Quæ ab ipſo Chriſto per Apoſtolos ad nos uſque manavit,*
c. 17. *& abhinc ad poſteros manatura eſt.* And yet more fully——*Dubitamus nos ejus eccleſiæ condere gremio, quæ, uſque ad confeſſionem generis humani, ab* Apoſtolica Sede *per ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum, fruſtra hæreticis circumlatrantibus, & partim plebis ipſius judicio, partim Conſiliorum gravitate, partim etiam miraculorum majeſtate* [i.e. by Miracles done in this Church after the Apoſtles times; of ſeveral of which S. *Auſtin* himſelf was an eye-witneſs, and alſo of ſome an Inſtrument] *damnatis*, culmen authoritatis *obtinuit*. Whereas
‖ *Epiſt.* 48. he obſerves of the *Donatiſts*‖ That in their diſcovery of which is the true Church they declined *Univerſality*, and appealed, as *Proteſtants* do, to the Marks of its true *obſervance* of the *Divine Precepts*, and *right adminiſtration* of the *Sacraments*; marks, according to their different perſwaſions, ſome men find in one Church, ſome in another——*Vos eſtis* ſaith he, *qui non ex totius orbis communione, ſed ex obſervatione præceptorum omnium divinorum, atque omnium Sacramentorum, tenetis Catholicam fidem.* And——*Acutum aliquid videris dicere, dum Catholicæ nomen non ex totius orbis communione interpretaris, ſed ex obſervatione præceptorum omnium divinorum* &c. And I have thus copiouſly cited him, the more fully to ſatisfy the candid Reader in this matter of the greateſt conſequence; and that the places in him, that ſeem more *clear*, may prevent the miſtaking gloſſes that may be made on ſome *other*. This of S. *Auguſtine's* being no ſtranger to the Church's Sovereign Authority, and Infallibility in her Definitions, and that the obeying Her was the obeying the *command* of our *Lord*, and conforming to the *verity* of *Scripture*; and the knowing of her eaſy by the forementioned marks.

Pag. 252. *l.* 14. S. Auſtin *was willing to bring it to that iſſue, that what the Catholick Church, after ſo much diſcuſſing the point, had agreed upon ſhould be received as the truth.* *As a Truth*;

Truth; So may that, which indeed is an errour. But S. *Auſtin* every where contends, as was but now ſhewed, that it muſt be a moſt certain *truth* which a General Conncil of the Catholick Church agreed in, and determined ſo; and in this had the *Donatiſts* no way contradicting him. So Cont. Creſcon. l. 1. c. 28. He ſaith to the Donatiſt——*Unam fidem eſſe*——*Unam incorruptam* [i.e. not erring] *& Catholicam eccleſiam, Hæc inter nos conveniunt.* And *De Unit. Eccl. c.* 24.——*Doce, huic Communioni tuæ*——*apertum aliquod & manifeſtum teſtimonium a Scripturis Canonicis perhiberi; & fateor ad te eſſe tranſeundum; nec aliter eſſe ſuſcipiendos Hæreticos quàm ſicut ſuſcipit Eccleſia in quâ es, quia tali teſtimonio* [Scripturarum] *declarata eſt:* [i.e. to be the true Church; and conſequently, that Truth to be maintained in it, which all are to follow. This then, whether the Catholick Church always defines a certain Truth, was no Queſtion between them; but, Whether their's, or his were this *Church Catholick*; (which Catholick Church theſe Churches being divided in Communion, was but one of them). This therefore the *Father* endeavoured to prove to the *Donatiſt*. And, if it be not a *certain truth* that ſuch Councils determine, for any thing I know, ὁμοούσιῳ alſo (for, Scriptures concerning it are ſtill eagerly diſputed on both ſides; and this point of *Non rebaptization* found in the *Creed* as well as it), may be brought in time only to be *received as a truth*, but not certainly concluded a *Truth*. And all this for avoiding *Church-Infallibility*, and maintaining an ill-grounded *Principle*. Which Church-*Infallibility* once caſhiered, what would become of the *Chriſtian Faith*, in ſo many Sects daily riſing up, and after a new mode ſtill interpreting the Scriptures?

Ibid. l. (9.) *S.* Auſtin *doth not hereby intend to make the Church's Authority to reſolve all doubts concerning Scriptures.*

No: but to reſolve all *doubts in* matters *neceſſary*.

Pag. 253 *l.* 11. *For neither* (*ſaith S.* Auſtin ||) *are we to yield to Catholick Biſhops themſelves, if they be at any time ſo much deceived as to hold what is contrary to Canonical Scriptures.* This is moſt certain. Certain, I ſay, though underitood of a General Council of theſe Catholick Biſhops, upon the ſuppoſition that theſe ſhould hold what is *contrary* to Canonical Scriptures; but S. *Auſtin* is farr from ſuppoſing (here, or in any other place) that theſe may hold ſo; eſpecially——*In manifeſtiſſimâ Voce Paſtoris, & in voce ejus clarâ & apertâ*; in a matter wherein the Scriptures are very clear of which he there ſpeaks. Or, if theſe General Councils ſhould interpret any ſuch Scriptures in a contrary ſenſe to S. *Auſtin*, he is far from calling his ſenſe, *vox aperta* againſt them; or, from not believing theirs,

|| *De Unitâ. Eccleſ. c.* 11.

theirs, and not his, to be the true sense of this *Voice* of the *Pastor*; Concerning whom united in such a Body he saith ‖——*Sufficit Ecclesiam contra aliquid sentire, ut illud non recipiamus in fidem.* But the *Father* evidently speaks of some Catholick Bishops, holding something contrary to Scripture, but also to the *other* Bishops, as appears by the words following——*Sed qui custodito Unitatis & Charitatis Vinculo* [i.e. with the rest from whom they differ in opinion] *in hoc incidunt*, &c. Nor have we any so sure Judge when some Catholick Bishops do so, as this whole Body of them *dissenting*. He proceeds.

‖ *lib. de Hæres.*

Ib. l. 14. *By which it is evident that he supposed no Infallibility in the Guides* of the Church. *i.e.* single, or a few, contradicted by the more, and superiour.

Ib. l. 16. *And in termes he asserts* ‖, *that the Church is to be proved by nothing but plain Scriptures, neither by the authority of* Optatus, *or* S. Ambrose, *or innumerable Bishops, nor Councils, nor Miracles. In termes he asserts?* No. These are not S. *Austins* words truly translated or quoted. After S. *Austin* Ib. c. 18. had thus spoken to the *Donatists*——*Remotis omnibus talibus, Ecclesiam suam demonstrent, si possunt; non in sermonibus & rumoribus Afrorum, non in Conciliis Episcoporum suorum, non in literis quorumlibet disputatorum, non in signis & prodigiis fallacibus*, &c. *sed in præscripto Legis* &c. And again‖ *Ecclesiam in Scripturis Canonicis debemus agnoscere, non in vanis hominum rumoribus & opinionibus, & factis & dictis & visis inquirere* [things the *Donatists* pleaded against him] I say, After this he proceeds in these words which are translated by the Dr——*Sed utrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant, non nisi de divinarum Scripturarum canonicis libris ostendant: quia nec nos propterea dicimus nobis credi oportere, quòd in Ecclesiâ Christi sumus; quia ipsam, quam tenemus, commendavit* Milevitanus Optatus, *vel* Mediolanensis Ambrosius, *vel alii innumerabiles nostræ communionis Episcopi; aut quia nostrorum collegarum Conciliis ipsa prædicata est, aut quia per totum in locis sanctis, quæ frequentat nostra communio, tanta mirabilia vel exauditionum vel sanitatum fiunt* &c. Where S. *Austin* saith not, that the Church can be proved by nothing, but *plain Scripture*: Or denies, that *General Councils*, or *true Miracles*, or *Universal Tradition* are no sufficient proof thereof; Of which *General Councils* he speaks nothing here, but of those of the two Parties, *Concilia Episcoporum suorum* on one side, and *Concilia nostrorum Collegarum* on the other: And we may see in the quotations before *Note on p.* 251. *l.* (12.) S. *Austin* knowing the *Scriptures* from the *Church*; and the *Church* from other marks; amongst which true *Miracles* surely are the highest proof of any Truth,

‖ *De Unita. Eccles. c.* 19

and

and ſo were of the Apoſtles their being Gods true Church and Miniſters: But the *Father*, to the *Donatiſts* allowing with him the Scriptures, urgeth the *Church* as demonſtrable by *their* clear teſtimony; not as the *only* teſtimony, but the *chief*, and ſuch as more than this needed not: and exacts of them, that he waving theſe other *proofs* on his ſide, wherein he had much the advantage of them by his *innumerabiles Epiſcopi* (which ſurely ought to carry it againſt theirs) and *vera Miracula*; ſo they would the urging of their *Councils* far inferior, and their *Miracles*, fallacious, on their ſide; and bring, in their defence, Anti-Scriptures to his Scriptnres. In theſe things I referr my ſelf to the candid Examiner of the place.

Ib. l. (6.) *He endeavours to bring them to a reſolution in the other point* [the Church] *for the clearing of this* [non-Rebaptization]. But, how doth proving ſuch a Society as defines *Non-rebaptization* to be the true *Church* clear Non-rebaptization to be the right practiſe (which S. *Auſtin* inferrs from it) if this Church, proved, yet may err in defining it ſo?

Pag. 255. *l.* (10). || *And of theſe General Councils the former are often amended by the latter.* As this place is often urged by Proteſtants, ſo it is anſwered to by Catholicks, that, taking the Fathers words *plenaria Concilia* or General Councils as relating to the words immediatly preceding *quæ fiunt ex univerſo orbe Chriſtiano* (which is not neceſſary), ſuch General Councils may correct and amend one another, the latter the former, as to ſeveral things; though, never, as to *Dogmata Fidei*. For, as Cardinal *Bellarmine* ||——*In Conciliis maxima pars actorum ad fidem non pertinet*——*ſed tantùm ipſa nuda decreta; & ea non omnia, ſed tantùm quæ proponuntur tanquam de fide. Interdum enim Concilia aliquid definiunt non ut certum, ſed ut probabile.* He grants Ibid. that ——*Concilia in judiciis particularibus*, i.e. *ubi non affirmatur aliquid generale & toti eccleſiæ commune, errare poſſunt.* So he grants (2. l. 7. c.)——*Quoad aliqua præcepta morum, Concilia plenaria priora emendari per poſteriora*, upon S. *Auſtin's* reaſon, *quando experimento aliquo aperitur quod clauſum erat* &c. If S. *Auſtins* words mean this, ſo Catholicks grant it. || *S. Auſtin de Baptiſm. l. 2. c. 3. N. 1.* || *De Concil. l. 2. c. 12.*

But 2ly. If S. *Auſtins* words muſt be underſtood of ſuch plenary and abſolutely *General* Councils, without any remitting of the higheſt ſenſe of the word, (whenas indeed theſe words *Univerſale, Generale, Plenarium*, were applied to Councils of a ſmaller Collection of Biſhops, when this from ſeveral parts: and, a little after this quotation, the *Father* ſaith concerning *Rebaptization*, that——*Dintiùs, per orbis terrarum regiones, multis hinc* *N. 2.*

hinc atque hinc disputationibus & collationibus Episcoporum, pertractata est. And several Synods were for it held in the *East*, as well as in *Affrick*||); thus what the *Father* saith here will make nothing for him as to his present Controversy with the *Donatist* about *Rebaptization*: Nay, more against him. For, there were no two such *Councils*, that were both General whereof the latter had amended the former concerning *Rebaptization* at all: and, had there, the same uncertainty of truth would have been in the decree of the latter, as of the former: and in this case the *Donatist* would not have failed to have taken the advantage of the *Former General* Councils.

|| *See Euseb. l.7.c.4.*

N. 3. But 3ly. applying S. *Austins* words [*Ipsa plenaria sapè priora posterioribus emendari*] as in reason we ought, to the times preceding his; as also considering those other words he adds, *sine ullo typho sacrilegæ superbiæ*, &c. he seems to speak || of the *plenary* but illegal *Arian Councils*, that were not plenary in the largest comprehension, amended by the 2d General Council of *Constantinople* and that at *Sardica*; For, as is said, if we understand *sapè* here of legal plenary Councils, we find none at all before his times, either as to *Rebaptization*, or any other points of faith, *amending* one another. These things, then, being left to the Reader's consideration, which may best fit the place: I add,

|| *See contra Maximinum, l.3.c.14.*

N. 4. 4. Lastly; That, whatever the sense be, this place can never be understood of Lawful General Councils amending one another, as to any matters of *necessary* faith; that such *Councils*, when defining any thing to be by all Christians believed and assented to, when declaring Hereticks all that dissent, and perhaps inserting such their Definitions into the *Creed*, yet may be *amended* after this by latter. For, this would overthrow the old foundations of the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creed; and whatever could be shewn of *one* such Council thus erring, *Hereticks* at their pleasure would apply to *any other*. This also would overthrow particularly S. *Austin's*——*Veritas eliqaata & declarata*: And——*plenarium Concilium confirmavit & consolidavit* for Non-rebaptization (the chief, if not the only, argument he useth for convincing the *Donatists*); whilst they might here plead, this was still *latens* and *clausum*, till more experience in a latter Council should open and disclose it: and so must all before cited out of S. *Austin* be also reversed; and all the former Heresies revive again, which, pretending *Scriptures* for their Tenents, have been quelled by the judgment of such *Councils*.

Pag. 256. *l.* 4. *Would he assert, that all Councils how General soever may be amended by following Councils, and yet bind men to believe*

believe that the decrees of the former Councils do contain the unalterable will of God? i.e. Suppoſing S. *Auſtin* here to ſpeak of abſolutely *General* and *Legal Councils*, would he aſſert, that in ſome things, as in *matters of fact*, a Council may poſſibly erre and ſo maybe amended by others following, which Council in ſome other things, its *Definitions* of *faith*, delivers the unalterable will of God, & cannot be amended? Yes. This may well be. But I conceive this Father not to ſpeak here of abſolutely *General* and legal *Councils*, their being amended by others. The Council of *Nice* preceded the *Arian* Councils which pretended to amend it, Did not S. *Auſtin* bind men to believe the *Decree* of *Nice*, which Decree he ſaith ||—*In Concilio* Nicæno *adverſus Hæreticos* Arianos *a Catholicis Patribus veritatis authoritate & authoritatis veritate firmatum eſt*. How is that ſo *confirmed*, that is ſtill liable to *amendment*? *l.*3.*c.*13. Or, if all decrees are not, how know we when they are ſo? Or are thoſe Decrees, that are ſo liable, univerſally to be believed, Diſſenters anathematized, the Creeds enlarged with them, till ſuch time as they be *amended?*

|| *Contra Maximin.*

Ib. l. 11. *Which words of his cannot be underſtood of unlawful Councils, of matters of fact or practice, but do refer to the great Queſtion then in debate about rebaptizing Heretick.* If S. *Auſtins* words touching former General Councils erring and being amended by latter do refer, as our Author here ſaith, to the point of *Rebaptization*, the *Father* hath deſtroyed his great *Argument* of the *Donatiſts* their certainly erring in it, becauſe a General Council had defined the contrary to it; the *Decree* of which Council might *err* and be repeal'd by another. And this, after that his former words, namely that *Provincial Councils are to yield without diſpute to thoſe which are General*, (if he had ſtopped there), had clearly confuted them. 2ly. S. *Auſtins* words alſo, as applied to this point, would be falſe: for never was any former *General Council* concerning this point of Rebaptization corrected by a latter; the firſt decreeing for it, the latter againſt it.

Ib. l. (11) *He* [S. Auſtin] *grants, that the arguments drawn from the Church's authority are but humane. Humane authority* (ſaith *Archbiſhop Laud* ||) may be *infallible* enough, and an argument drawn from it, convincing: Eſpecially from that of General Councils, which are divinely aſſiſted not to err in neceſſaries. But this Authority meanwhile is no hindrance that S. *Auſtin* may not alſo urge with, and rather than, it (but he never doth as contrary to it) the Divine Authority in Scriptures, where he thinks them to all Rational men cleare and manifeſt.

|| *p.* 124.

Pag. 257. *l.* 6. *And elſwhere he appeals not to the judgment*

of

of men, but to the Lords ballance. None of theſe inſtances imply any compariſon or oppoſition made by S. *Auſtin* between the *Scriptures* and the judgment of a *General Council*, as if theſe *Scriptures* might be cleare, where the *Judgment* of the Council contrary; but imply, that theſe *Scriptures*, where cleare, may be diſceeded from by ſome *private*, though learned, mens judgments; and, in any ſuch caſe, are doubtleſs to be preferred before them. But whither tend theſe quotations? To the liberty of *private* men to judge of the *definitions* of *General Councils*? That is, of *Donatiſts* to judge of that of *Nice* made againſt them in Rebaptization? This deſtroys S. *Auſtins* whole deſigne which was to have them to acquieſce in the *Decree* of a *General Council.*

Ib. l. (12). *The utmoſt by a careful conſideration of his mind in this matter that I can find, is; that in a queſtion of ſo doubtful and obſcure a nature as that was, which had been ſo long bandied in the Churches of* Africa, *and from thence ſpred over all the Churches of the Chriſtian world, it was a reaſonable thing to preſume that what the whole Chriſtian world did conſent in was the truth, not upon the account of an infallibility, but the reaſonable ſuppoſition, that all the Churches of the Chriſtian world would not conſent in a thing repugnant to any Apoſtolical doctrine or tradition.* Here our Author ſaith, that in a Queſtion of ſo doubtful & obſcure a nature, and that had been firſt ſo much diſcuſſed, it is a reaſonable thing to *preſume*, & a reaſonable *ſuppoſition* [not then a certain Poſition], that all the Churches in the world will not conſent in a thing repugnant to any Apoſtolical Doctrine, or Tradition: & ſo *Non-rebaptization* [put in the Creed] may be a *preſumed* Truth; and the *Donatiſt's* a *preſumed* Hereſy: Where, I think he will not ſay, we do *preſume* things that we are *certain* of. Is then S. *Auſtin's*——*In hac re tenetur à nobis veritas Scripturarum*——and——*Chriſtus perhibet teſtimonium Eccleſiæ ſuæ* &——*Columna & firmamentum veritatis*, And——*veritas eliquata & conſolidata*——come to this? a *reaſonable ſuppoſition*, and a fair *preſumption* of Truth? But yet, will He ſtand to this? that whatever the Church in her General Councils ſhall conſent to, it is a *reaſonable ſuppoſition, that ſhe conſents to nothing repugnant to any Apoſtolical Doctrine or Tradition?* and that ſuch may be *preſumed* a *Truth?* If ſo: will not this inferr a duty of Aſſent alſo to all her Decrees at leaſt as preſumed truths? And, if in a Queſtion of ſo *doubtful* and obſcure a nature as *Rebaptization* is, our Author allows this preſumtion on the Church's ſide, ought he not much more in a *clearer*?

Pag. 258. *l. ult* S. *Auſtins* words.——*The cuſtom of the Church having been confirmed by a General Council*, &c. *It may now be*

now ſaid, that we follow, what Truth hath declared. Doth not S. *Auſtin* here, from Non-Rebaptization being confirmed by a General Council, which examined Cuſtome and Scriptures, declare himſelf ſecure of this truth not to be amended by latter Councils?

Pag. 259. *l.* 13. *That in a matter of ſo doubtful and obſcure a nature,* &c. *we are to believe that to be the truth which the Church of Chriſt agreed in,* &c. And afterward he ſaith——*In ſuch a caſe as this* [and ſo he ſaith before, || *in a queſtion ſo doubtful*] he agrees || p. 257. to what S. *Auſtin* ſaith; and *thinks a man very much relieved by following ſo evident a conſent of the Univerſal Church,* [but the not ſo relieved S. *Auſtin* declares Hereticks] *not by vertue of any Infallibility, but the unreaſonableneſs of believing, that ſo many ſo wiſe ſo diſintereſſed perſons ſhould be deceived. That in a matter of ſo doubtful and obſcure a Nature.* What means this limitation? Are we to believe that to be truth which Councils determine in matters obſcure (I ſuppoſe he means, generally obſcure); but not ſo in matters more clear? One would think the contrary rather. But, who is to *judge,* when the Queſtion or matter is *obſcure*; ſince on this depends our aſſent to the Council? The *Donatiſt,* for example, in this matter of *Rebaptization*? But, he will ſay, This matter is clear enough on his ſide. And ſo this Author promiſing as to preſent Controverſies the ſame ſubmiſſion, in *caſe* of *obſcurity,* to a General Council, this caſe, here, of obſcurity will not be found; becauſe theſe points, they ſay, are *clear* on their ſide; and they offer demonſtration of them. But, if *Proteſtants* will affirm, that we are to believe that to be the truth which General Councils reſolve, without limiting it to certain caſes; *becauſe it is,* as he ſaith, *unreaſonable to believe, ſo many ſo wiſe ſo diſintereſſed perſons ſhould be deceived,* and then grant, that conſequently in *neceſſaries* theſe *Councils* muſt not *err*; (for, ſo we ſhould be obliged to believe in neceſſaries ſomething wrong and falſe), this would be as much as we deſire.

Ib. l. (3). *Let the ſame evidences be produced for the conſent of the Univerſal Church from the Apoſtolical times in the matters in diſpute between our Church and that of* Rome; *and the controverſy of Infallibility may be laid aſide.* What was the *Conſent* of the univerſal Church from the Apoſtolical times, was the Queſtion between S. *Auſtin* and the *Donatiſts.* For, the *Donatiſts* alſo pleaded a contrary *Tradition* againſt the *Catholicks.* See *Firmilian* Ep. 75. *apud* Cyprian——*Cæterùm nos veritati & conſuetudinem jungimus,* &c. as alſo the ſame *Conſent* is controverted now concerning many points between the *Roman* Church and *Proteſtants.*

Now, for a sufficient and certain decision of the truth in this *Question*, viz. what the former Tradition was, or what was our Lords will in this matter, S. *Austin* urgeth the consent of the *present* Church met in a *General Council* and there discussing the matter. Where S. *Austin* doth not require the *Donatists* submission to the *Consent* of the universal Church from the *Apostolical* times first *proved* to them (i.e. they confessing it so; for, this, if proved to them, *Donatists* did not, nor could not decline (as now neither doth the Dr.——*Let the Pope's Supremacy* &c *be proved by an universal consent of Antiquity* &c. p. 244. and here——*Let the same evidence be produced for the consent of the universal Church from the Apostolical times* &c. that is, as I understand him, Let such a consent be evidenced to us): But S. *Austin* requires their submission and belief to the *latter General Council* (of *Nice* or *Arles*, or both, it matters not), declaring what was the *former Apostolical Tradition*. Which, if the *Infallibility* of this Council needs not be stood on as to the *Donatist's* obedience, yet it is, in the Council's determination of any necessaries, as to Christians believing in such necessaries a *Truth* (of which necessaries also this Council, not their Subjects, is to judge): And the *Father's* words would have weighed little with these *Affricans*, perswading them to obey the Councils *Sentence*, though an *erroneous*. Therefore he fortifies the Councils Decree with the former expressions——*Christus perhibet testimonium*; And *In hâc re tenetur Scripturarum veritas*.

Pag. 260. *l.* 9. *Let them never think to fob us off with the consent of some latter ages for a tradition from Apostolical times.* But He ought to admit and submit to any universal consent of the Apostolical Churches of any *latter age* concerning what is the *Tradition* from *Apostolical* times; as S. *Austin* admitted it; and declared the *Donatists* Hereticks for not admitting it. He goes on.

Ib. l. 10. *Nor of a packed company of Bishops for a truly General Council.* He hath reason. But surely there will need no packing of Bishops for their voting such a matter *in Council*, which all the Bishops of the Christian world, (or, if it be but the much major part of them) have abetted, and maintained, taught and practiced, *before* such *Council*. And so it was in the Councils held before *Luther's* appearance, and also afterward in that of *Trent*, that for the greatest part of the *Western* Bishops, who could only be convened in it, (but the same may be said as truly of the *Eastern* too), were, in most of the *controversies* there decided against the *Protestants*, so perswaded in their judgment *before* their meeting in that Council, as they, or others afterward, voted *in* it.

Annota-

Annotations on his §. 15. of Church-Authority, *ſaid not to be deſtroyed by the Dr's* Principles.

P*Ag.* 260. *l.* 15. *The laſt thing to be conſidered is, whether the ſame arguments which overthrow Infallibility, do likewiſe deſtroy all Church-Authority?* N.O. ſheweth, ſome reaſonings in the Dr's *Principles*, with which he endeavoured to deſtroy *Church-Infallibility*, to ruine alſo as much or more *Church-Authority*; *viz.* as to their office of *Teaching* Chriſts flock and *expounding* to them the *Scriptures*. Theſe particular reaſonings of the Dr queſtioned for this, *N.O.* expected, ſhould in an Anſwer to him, have been reſumed by the Dr, and juſtified. But, in the firſt of theſe quotations, that follow, out of *N.O.* p. 50. he finds our Author mentioning *N.O's Conſequence* indeed, but omitting the *Argument* immediately preceding, from which he inferred it; *viz. Firſt Obſerve, that whatever Divine aſſiſtance is advanced here* [viz. in the Dr's 19. *Principle*] *againſt the aſſurance that can be received from Church-Infallibility the ſame is more advanced againſt any aſſurance that may be had from Church-Authority*; And ſo Church-Authority as to this matter is throwh off by him as well as Church-Infallibility. To this Obſervation the Dr ſaith nothing. In the 2d Quotation out of p. 70. he finds him mentioning the *Charge N.O.* layes upon him of juſtly incurring the diſpleaſure of his Eccleſiaſtical Superiours (as indeed all *Chillingworths* followers ſeeme to do, corrupting ſomthing which formerly remained good in the Church of *England*; and, which being good, all good men have reaſon to wiſh well to, and that it may be preſerved there; for, that which is good, ſtill preparing the way to ſomething better, may end at laſt in an happy *reunion* of the divided *Churches* and this may ſerve to *anſwer* this Author's *Ironical* deſcant here p. 261. 262.); but finds him omitting here to take any notice of *N.O's Reaſon* for it immediatly preceding *viz.*——Here [i.e. in his 29th *Principle*] firſt obſerve: That *what no Chriſtian is obliged to believe under any pretence of Church-Infallibility, he is much rather not obliged to believe under any pretence of Church-Authority: and that the Dr's freeing the Church's ſubjects here* [i.e. as to their believing what theſe Governours teach them] *from the former, doth ſo from the latter.* Thus *N.O.* Neither replies he any thing to this. The 3d Quotation out of p. 84. is applied to one particular *Conſequence* of the Dr's, || In which he ſaith——*There is no neceſſity at all or uſe of an Infallible Society of men to aſſure men of the truth of thoſe things of* || *Conſeq.* 1.

which they may be certain without, and cannot have any greater assurance, supposing such Infallibility to be in them. Which *Consequence* of his, *N.O.* saith,—*concludes the usefulness as well of any Ecclesiastical Authority to teach men, as of an* Infallible, *to assure men of, the truth of those things, which, by using only their own sincere endeavour* (*according to the Dr's pretence,* Principle 13.) *they may know without them.* To this likewise the Dr answers nothing. And here also, Whereas *N.O.* speaks in particular, *This Consequence concludes,* &c. he puts instead thereof, that *N.O.* saith, *his* Principles *against Infallibility conclude,* &c. In the 4th quoted out of p. 98. where *N.O.* after the words cited by the Dr, [viz.: *That the Principles laid down by him do not afford any effectual way or means in this Church of suppressing or convicting any Schism, Sect, or Heresy, or reducing them either to submission of judgment or silence:*] proceeds to give the reason of this—*For, where both sides contend Scripture clear from themselves, the clearness of such Scripture, how great soever it be on one side, can be made no instrument of conviction to the other:* the Dr mentions not this *Reason,* nor speaks he to it. In the 5th Quotation out of p. 99. where, after the words quoted by the Dr, [*that the Authority of the Church of* England *is much debilitated,* &c, *by this new way taken up of its defence*] *N.O.* thus gives the *Reason* of them in what follows: *viz. where he thinks himself its best Advocate and defender of its cause, who doth most endeavour to set forth the defects and failings of all such Ecclesiastical Societies; Prelates, and Councils, and best proves no Scripture-Promises made to them:* Neither from this doth he clear himself, or others; But, instead of taking notice of these particulars urged against him, he extracts from the foresaid Assertions in *N.O.* stript of the particular *Reasons* and *Arguments* annexed, this Universal *Proposition,* that *N.O.* maintains, *that the same Arguments* (i.e. *all* the same arguments; for, I suppose he would here have his indefinite terme understood universally by his Reader) *which overthrow Infallibility, do likewise destroy all Church-Authority: all Church-authority* saith he; *i.e.* all parts of it, not that only of their *Office,* as they are the *Preachers* and *Expounders* of Christs *Gospel* to the People, of which only *N.O.* speaks; and then, on this, he frames a new Discourse, first divided into Heads. But, any such *proposition N.O.* disclaimes; Yet, this He affirms, that some of the Dr's arguings in his *Principles*, which he brings for destroying Church-Infallibility, do also destroy *Church-Authority* as to one *part* of it; and also names those *arguings* of his: and wisheth, that this Author, in pretending an *Answer,* had cleared them from this charge.

Pag. 262.

Pag. 262. *l.* 8. *If they thought they could not ſow miſchief*, &c. A rent, already too wide, is by our Author's new *Principles* ſtill made wider, and ſo leſs hopes of quite cloſing it. And this is juſtly reſented by *N.O.* as contrary to his chiefeſt *Intereſt*.

Ib. l. 10. *It is a pretty plot*, &c. True *deſignes* of defending may poſſibly undermine; and thoſe may be the trueſt Friends, who are taken for profeſſed Enemies. This the *Future Judgment* will ſhew.

Ib. l. 15. (3.) *Undermine all Church-Authority*; and *authority wholly uſeleſs*: *All* and *wholly* are none of *N.O's* expreſſions; his words muſt be added to, that they may be refuted.

Pag. 263. *l.* 1. *Such malignant influence muſt be from one of theſe things. Either becauſe I deny infallibility in the Guides of the Church*, You deny *Infallibility* as to *neceſſaries*; whereby none can *ſecurely* yield aſſent to any thing that the Church *defines*.

Ib. l. 2. *Or becauſe I ſay, that the Scriptures are plain in things neceſſary to ſalvation.* You ſay *Plain* to *all* ſo far, as that none, uſing his own endeavour (*i.e.* according to his *condition*), can miſtake in them; which makes men, being confident of the plainneſs of *Scripture* and of *their own* diligence and judgment, neglect repairing to the *Church's* direction and guidance in matters that moſt concern them. And hence grow ſuch an infinite number of *Sects*, (after the direction of their *Spiritual Guides* caſt off,) *Independants*, *Quakers*, *Presbyterians*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Antinomians*, *Soliſidians*, *Socinians*, and I know not what. But note here, that *N.O.* no where ſaith, which our Author here ſeems to impoſe, that One, to *make uſe* of another's guidance or direction, muſt have him *infallible*: But ſaith only this, which no way infers the other, that, where all things neceſſary are affirmed plain to a man only uſing his own endeavour to underſtand them, One, wherin he thinks he uſeth his own juſt endeavour, may juſtly think alſo therein, *anothers* guidance (whether this fallible, or infallible) to be *unneceſſary*. Unleſs the Dr will here relieve himſelf by one of theſe two ways: Either that, though a ſufficient ſelf-endeavour ſufficeth, yet none can know *certainly* when he hath uſed it. Or that, in mentioning a mans uſing his *endeavour*, this Author involves principally the repairing to his Guides for their inſtruction. But then, this latter argues the Scriptures, wherein he conſults them, not plain, but obſcure rather, as hath been often ſaid; and ſo defeats what he would chiefly maintain.

Ibid. l. 4. *Or, Becauſe I deny the Authority of the Church of Rome.* You deny not only the *authority* of the Church of *Rome*,

Rome, as contradistinct to other *Catholick* Churches, but the *Authority* of the *Church Catholick* as to its justly requiring submission of private mens judgments to its Definitions in matters of Necessary Faith.

Ib. l. 6. *Or, because I am not for such an effectual way of suppressing Sects and Heresies, as is in use in the* Roman *Church.* No: But because you are not for *any* effectual way at all.

Ib. l. (10). *But I pray, Sir, are Authority and Infallibility all one in your account?* No. *N.O.* his affirming some of this Authors *Principles* to take away the Church's *Authority*, as to some part of it, as well as its *Infallibility*, makes not these *two one*. And therefore the pains here to prove these different, and that one takes not away the other, is *lost*.

Ib. l. (8). *We suppose that Magistrates and Parents and Masters have all of them an unquestionable authority, but I never heard yet of any man that said they were infallible.* Some part of the *Church's* authority is greater than that of *Civil Magistrates*, *Masters*, or *Parents*; viz. the *deciding* of *Truth* and *Error* *lawful* and *unlawful*, in *Divine* matters; or the defining of points Controverted in Gods Word, and in matters of necessary faith; and, the power of obliging Subjects to *belief* and *assent* thereto: and this part of their authority must also be joined with *Infallibility* as to Necessaries, that their Subjects therein may not *err*. For, other our *Superiours*, Civil magistrats, Parents, Masters *&c*, as they have no *Infallibility*, so they are deficient in one branch of *Authority*: whose proposals we only admit, when we believe them to be truth; and practise their commands, when we believe them first to be lawful; lawful, I mean, by the *Divine* law; but, where there is any *doubt* herein, we repair to the *Ecclesiastical Court* for the resolution of them, and so proceed to obey, or disobey, the other's commands: and for this reason, see before, in *Note* on p. 116. l. 11. Mr *Chillingworth* candidly granting *infallibility* necessary to an *Ecclesiastical Judge*, though not so to a *Civil*; but, still to save his *phanomena*, denying such an Ecclesiastical Judge *necessary*. Lastly, I ask; will this Author yield no more submission at all to the Authority of the Church defining Controversies in *Religion*, than to his *Prince*, or *Parents*, defining them?

Ib. l. (3). *Why may we not allow any Authority belonging to the Governours of the Church, and yet think it possible for them to be deceived? Some Authority* which they, I mean General Councils, have claimed, we cannot allow, if they may be *deceived*; *viz.*: not that of enjoining a *certain* Assent to their definitions in matters of *necessary* Faith. For, a Church *fallible* in *necessa-*

ries

ries can, in nothing at all which she proposeth, justly oblige her subjects to any absolute and certain belief.

Pag. 264. *l.* 7. *These are strange ways of arguing* &c. Strange, indeed; but not these, or any like ways of arguing to be shewed in *N.O.*

Ib. l. (6). *But it may be said* &c. But no such thing is said by *N.O.*

Pag. 266. *l.* 6. *The meaning of all this is* &c. I willingly grant to our Author, without the demonstration of his many instances, that if one using a *Guide* afterward by experience finds he hath guided him wrong, (as he may find this, when he *misseth* of his *end*), he hath reason for the future to desert him. And thus, upon this *supposition*, may any reject *N.O.'s* Guide, a lawful General Council. But, I hope, this Author is a man of more modesty than to say, * that such Councils, or universal consent of the Church any other way known, do misguide men in the *Principles* of *Religion*, or *common precepts*, which are so *plain*, that every Christian may know their *misguiding*; and meanwhile the Councils themselves either not know it, or, knowing, yet impose such falsities; and that in the profession of their own faith, as well as others: Or, say * that they command them, *to believe against their eye-sight*; in any thing, but what themselves also do believe upon the *Divine Revelation*, more infallible than *sense*: or, *to break the plain Commands of God* &c. Or, if he will say they do so; I know, *N.O.* will say the contrary.

Ib. l. (2). *And this is not to destroy all authority* &c. That a Church-Authority fallible may be of great use for its direction, as it is said here by Dr *St*, so it is granted by *N.O.*: who also requires *submission of judgment* to it, though fallible, especially from the *illiterate*, for many good reasons; || but will He allow as much?

|| *See the former Discourse*, §. 37 *&c.*

Pag. 267. *l.* 1. *For they may be of great use for the direction of unskilful persons in matters that are doubtful.* But he will not say here, in any *necessaries doubtful*: since he contends that these are plain also to the unskilful.

Ib. l. 12. *I shall now shew what real authority is still left in the Governours of the Church, though Infallibility be taken away.* That a *reall authority* is still left in the Governours of the Church, though *Infallibility* be taken away, is granted to him without his proof: but this is also maintained as well consistent with it; that these Governours, united in Council, have an *Infallibility* in all their Definitions concerning *Necessaries*; and *this given them from our Lord*; and that this by any other *Authority*, he can shew given

von them, is not taken away.

Ibi. (12). *An authority left in the Church-Governours of receiving into, and excluding out of, the Communion of the Church.*

I add; and an Authority the Church hath of excluding, amongſt other things, for *Hereſy*, againſt the *infallible* definitions of the Church.

Ib. l. (7). *Which authority* [viz. of inflicting Cenſures upon offenders, and of receiving into, and excluding out of the Communion of the Church] *belongs to the Governours of the Church; and however the Church in ſome reſpects be incorporated with the Common-Wealth in a Chriſtian State, yet its fundamental rights remain diſtinct from it.* * Here means he, that the Church (as this being a fundamental right of it) may inflict ſuch Cenſures and exclude from its communion ſuch perſons as juſtly incurr them, (to which I may add its *declarative power* of what is God's will or truth in particular doctrines of faith, mentioned by him below p. 269.) *without* or *againſt* the conſent of the *Civil State*, or the Supreme Governour thereof: *viz.* when he prohibites the Exerciſe of ſuch *Cenſures*, or *Declaration* of ſuch a particular *Doctrine*, to his Subjects? Which Power if our Lord hath given his Church, and then hath given alſo to the Civil Magiſtrate, if Chriſtian, another power of prohibiting to the Church the Exerciſe of this Power, will not this be, to uſe the Dr's expreſſion ||, *to give it a power with one hand, and take it away with the other?* And, ſince the Church exerciſed this power given by our Lord before it was incorporated into the Civil State, and then when the Civil State alſo prohibited exerciſe of ſuch a power, it ſeems moſt reaſonable, as the Dr ſaith elſwhere † *that no acceſſion to the Church* [of the Civil State] *can invalidate its former Title, or Right.* But then, how will all this conſiſt with the *Oath* of *Supremacy*, which Supremacy is therein given to the Civil Magiſtrate without any exception of theſe, the Church's fundamental Rights? unleſs the Dr with Biſhop *Bramhal* holds the ſenſe of this *Oath* to maintain only an *external coactive power*, in ſuch ſpiritual matters, belonging to the *Civil Magiſtrate*: which I ſuppoſe no Catholick will deny to him: Or, unleſs he will ſay, that the *Oath* excludes a forreign *Church-Supremacy* diſtinct from that of the State, but not ſo a domeſtick one as to ſome fundamental Church-Rights. But then, how can the Eccleſiaſtical *Supremacy* of a *General Council*, though *forreign*, be excluded, where the Supremacy of an *inferiour* and *ſubordinate* Church-authority is admitted? * Or 2ly. means he, that the Church hath ſuch fundamental Rights given her by our Lord; but ſo, that ſhe may not actually exerciſe them in theſe things, whenever

|| *Irenicum. Diſc. of Excommunication* §. 9. p. 423.

† p. 446.

ever the Civil Power, if Chriſtian, doth oppoſe and prohibite them? But then, what if ſuch *Civil Power* ſhould happen to be (as poſſibly it may) *Heretical*? Here may the Church in ſuch a State neither declare ſtill ſuch Truths, nor inflict any Cenſures; I mean of Excommunication on ſuch as are reall Delinquents? And, to uſe the Dr's words ‖——*Can we imagine our Bleſſed Saviour ſhould inſtitute a Society, and leave it deſtitute of means to uphold it ſelf, unleſs it be ſuſtained by the Civil Power?——Whenas* (ſaith he before) *the Church flouriſhed in its greateſt purity, not only when not upheld, but when moſt violently oppoſed, by the Civil Power.* ‖ *Irenicum*, p. 422.

Ib. l. ult. Of which Rights this is one of the chief to receive into and exclude out of the Church ſuch perſons, which, according to the laws of a Chriſtian Society, are fit to be taken in, or ſhut out. Then, I hope, that this Society may alſo *keep Aſſemblies* as a fundamental Right, though theſe prohibited by the *Commonwealth*: and that the higheſt *Courts* thereof may exerciſe the foreſaid Juriſdiction over its members, into whatever *Commonwealth*, (though oppoſing this Church,) theſe members be incorporated.

Pag. 268. *l.* 12. *And in eſtabliſhing thoſe ancient Rites, of the Chriſtian Church, which are in themſelves of an indifferent nature.*

But, what if this Authority, being fallible, judge ſomthing *indifferent* that is not? May any be forced to obedience and the *practice* thereof (which he calls below *over-ruling the practice*), and conſequently, firſt to *aſſenting* to the *lawfulneſs* of a thing, wherein this Authority is fallible? And, if ſuch Authority execute its Cenſures on ſuch perſons diſobeying it, is not this *Tyranny*? Or, if not, why is that of the *Roman Church* ſo?

Ib. l. (5). *The Church hath an authority of propoſing matters of faith and directing men in Religion.* But ſo may any one, more learned than others, propoſe and direct them. But what thinks he of the Church s *deſining*, or impoſing, any ſuch matter of faith to be *believed*? Surely either the Church hath by Right ſuch an Authority, or the firſt four General Councils uſurped it. And doth not ſuch an *Authority*, if juſtifiable, inferr an *Infallibility*? But then, this *directing* and *propoſing* is, as to *Neceſſaries*, needleſs, where all is clear, and plainly propoſed in *Scripture* for every ones capacity without repairing to this *Authority*. But, if he means ſo plain in Scripture, that men following theſe their Guides cannot miſtake in it, the plainneſs lies not in the *Text*, but in their *Expoſition*.

Pag. 269. *l.* 15. *Authority to declare what the mind and will of God is contained in Scripture. &c.* And are the people to receive what they declare as ſuch? Or have they authority to declare,

, what they think the *mind* of *God* is, and their Auditors to judge whether it be contained in *Scripture*, every one for themselves? But, this latter must multiply *Sects*; and the former includes *Infallibility* in *Necessaries*.

Ib. l. (6). *Especially having all the ancient rights of a Patriarchal Church.* I suppose He here by the word *Patriarchal* claims no other rights or priviledges for the Church of *England* than those of a *Primatical* Church; such as those of the Churches of *France*, *Spain*, or *Affrick*; and that the *Primate* of *Canterbury* is no higher elevated by him than the *Primate* of *Carthage* or *Toledo*; and that, notwithstanding any such Primateship, the *Church* of *England* and the Prelates thereof are subject, as also those of *Spain France* or *Africk*, to any Reformation of errours made by Superiour Councils, whether *Patriarchal* of the *West*, or *General* of the whole Church Catholick: both which Councils also are acknowledged Superiour to *National*, or *Provincial*, by learned *Protestants*.

Ib. l. ult. To do as much as in them lyes to reform them, viz. *by requiring a consent to such Propositions as are agreed upon for that end, of those who are to enjoy the publick offices of teaching and instructing others.* N. 1. Here he allows a just authority in *Anglican* National Synods to agree upon, declare and publish, any propositions for reforming or correcting of errours in the *Doctrine* of *Religion*; *i.e.* as I understand him, only, or chiefly, in matters of *faith*, (though he doth not name it); the care of the preservation of which faith in their several precincts is committed to the *Bishops* of the *Church*; *To publish and declare*, he saith, *what those errours are, and to reform them*; & it is said also in the 20*th* Article of the Church of *England*, that *the Church hath authority in Controversies of faith*: but not so, *as to ordain any thing contrary to God's written Word*: i.e. as I imagine, hath authority in *deciding* of such *Controversies*. For, what authority else can be shewed in matters of Controversy? since teaching must *follow* the *deciding* what is to be taught: and the *Article* requiring *that they do not ordain or decree any thing contrary to Gods written word, or enforce the same to be believed for necessity of salvation* seems to imply; they may decree, what they think is his Word. This Author also saith; *such Synod may require consent to*, (which, I suppose, is the same as assent or belief of the truth of), *such propositions as such Synod hath agreed on from those who are to enjoy the publick offices of teaching and instructing others*: i.e. from all the *Clergy*. Now to this I have these things to reply.

N. 2. 1st. In this his stating of the Church's Authority *to do as much*

much as in them lyes to reform errours in Religion, or Faith, here is no reſtraint of any who live in its Communion, ſave only of the *Clergy*, from erring their former errours: No conſent to its Decrees required of the reſt, but that they may be *Arian*, *Socinian*, *Neſtorian*, and what not, yet enjoy her Communion: may be partly compounded of Orthodox, partly Hereticks, as to the *Laicks*; in whom all opinions are tolerated. This, I ſay, follows; according *to his ſtating* this Authority *here* (for, the *Canons* of this Church ſeem contrary, and to require *aſſent* from all); and according to what this Dr hath ſaid alſo *elſewhere*, *Ration. Account.* p. 133. where he deſcribes the Church——*a Society of ſuch perſons, who all firmly believe that doctrine infallible which Chriſt delivered; but yet judge themſelves all fallible, and dare not uſurp that royall prerogative of heaven in preſcribing infallibly in matters queſtioned; but leave all* [men] *to judge according to the Pandects of the Divine Laws, becauſe each member of this Society is bound to take care of his ſoul, and of all things, that tend thereto. A very true and juſt repreſentative*, ſaith he, *of that ſociety of men, which our Bleſſed Saviour inſtituted as a* Church *in the world.* Now, there, the *Clergy* alſo as well as *Laity* ſeem left to their *liberty*; ſo that (to reconcile him to himſelf) perhaps the *conſent* here required of the Clergy is only *conditional*: this conſent not medling with their *faith*, wherein they are left to their Chriſtian liberty to hold what they think beſt; but only in order to ſuch an *employment*; that, if they do not teſtify their *Tenents* in Religion to be ſuch as ſute with the *Synod's Decrees*, they muſt not be admitted to bear ſuch an *Office*. For his following words are——*Not to the end that all thoſe Propoſitions* [to which a conſent is required of the Clergy] *ſhould* be believed *as Articles of Faith*: *But becauſe no Reformation can be effected, if perſons may be allowed to preach and officiate in the Church in a way contrary to the Deſign of ſuch a Reformation.* Thus He. But then, in the ſame way, why may not this Church exact aſſent of all perſons whatever, *i.e.* a *conditional* one, if they deſire to live in her reformed communion; yet not forcing their conſcience therein, but leaving them *the liberty* to ſtay out of it. And, ſince the deſigne or effects of the Reformation may be hindred alſo by learned Laicks their ſpreading abroad ſuch errours, why not, in order to this, ſuch aſſent required of them, as he ſaith is required, in Order to this, of the Clergy?

2ly. Such Church not being the Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Judge, & granted by our Author *fallible*, this Authority given to it, I mean of requiring *aſſent* of all its Clergy to all its doctrines or Articles of Religion ſeems very unjuſt, & ſerys equally as for the *reformati-* *N. 3.*

an of a former *errour*, so for the *corruption* of a former *truth*. For thus, supposing this Church *Arian* or *Socinian* (as it may be) here all its *Clergy*, receiving *Holy Orders* for the teaching of Gods word, are engaged to believe, and preach, a most impious *Heresy*; or to be *dis-clergied*, than which what can be a greater *tyranny*? Neither is there any remedy left in such a Church for rectifying such corruption or errour; since none are admitted into the Clergy, who do not assent to such errour; and are removed out of it, so soon as they recant it. And this is it the *Presbyterian Ministers* have so much complained of, that they might not be admitted to subscribe the 39. Articles with such a clause added [*so far forth as the same Articles are agreeable to Gods word*]. And indeed the forbidding a truth in this Church to be *taught* to the Laity is, in effect, the forbidding it to be *assented to* also, by them.

N. 4. 3ly. What authority he allows, in this kind, to one Primatical Church, he must to another; and therefore as he professeth such an *Authority* rightly exercised in the *Church of England* as to requiring *assent* from all the *Clergy* to her 39. *Articles*; so must he, that the same authority is so, in the Church of *Rome*. And thus, *Pope Pius's* Creed, so far as its requiring assent from all the *Roman Clergy*, by which this Clergy may only preach those *errours* (as he accounts them), and cannot declare the contrary *Truths*, is justified by himself; and the *Roman* Church maintained herein to exercise a lawful power.

N. 5. 4. But 4ly; If the Church of *England* hath such a lawful authority in the reformation of errours over its subjects, the same have superiour Councils (suppose, a *General*, or a *Patriarchal* in the *West*,) over it, and all other *Primatical Churches*: viz. of requiring *assent* from all the *Clergy*, whether Archbishops, Bishops, or inferiours, to all their Decrees; and, not to teach any thing contrary to them; and that, if not for imposing them as Articles of Faith, yet for the reason given by the Dr. *viz.* ——*because no Reformation can be effected by those Councils, if persons may be allowed to preach and officiate in those Churches in a way contrary to the designe of such a Reformation made by the Council.* And then, supposing here, under that pretended reformation of an error by such Council or Synod, a *corruption* of a *Truth*; and, that of moment, (a thing this Author allows possible); How can there be a reforming afterward of such a *Corruption*, unless done by *Laicks*? Or, may the Council lawfully require an *assent* to such corruption from all its subjects that are admitted into *sacred Orders*; and those that are so admitted, afterward when they discerne truth, as lawfully *renounce* and reverse such their former assent? These seem to be the consequences

consequences of the Dr's stating such an authority in his Church; consequences contrary to what he alloweth; and these arguings seem of force, especially against one that both accuseth the *Roman* Church, because fallible, for requiring *assent* to her Decrees; and refuseth *assent* to the Decrees of Superiour Councils, because these fallible.

But, notwithstanding this, I am far from affirming 1. That the Church Catholick in her Supreme Councils (whether fallible, or infallible) may not require assent of her subjects to her Definitions and Decrees, as she thinks fit, in matters that are not capable of a strict *Demonstration* against her judgment, as I suppose Divine matters are not: neither do I know any wiser or securer course (though, abstracting from the *Church's Infallibility*) that any Christian can take, as to attaining all necessary divine truth, than by his firm adhering to her judgment in all things, that is set over him by God himself to guide him in the way of salvation, of which much hath been said elsewhere. And 2ly. far also from affirming, that the *Church* of *England*, or any other National or Provincial Synod may not require *Assent* not only from her *Clergy*, but all her subjects to her Doctrines of Religion or matters of Faith, and that upon *Anathema* to all *Dissenters*: but then it must be for such doctrines wherein such Church or Synod doth not oppose, but agree with, the *whole Body* of the *present Catholick* Church, and so also with that of former times, according to the judgment of these times made by this present Church. Taking here this whole Body I speak of as contradistinct to *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Churches, or Societies; and taking the *consent* of this whole in such an *universality*, as is necessary for concluding the whole, according to the proceedings we have seen in the *first General Councils*. Now, in these *matters* wherein a *Provincial Council* agrees with the *whole* as it demands assent to them from its subjects, so is *it* infallible in them, if the *whole* be so. It follows. *N. 6.*

Pag. 270. *l.* 3. *Not to the end, that all those propositions should be believed as articles of faith.* *Not that all*; but doth the *Church* of *England* then require, that some of her propositions in the 39. *Articles* should be believed and assented to by them as *Articles* of her *Faith*? His saying *not all* seems to imply as much; and see *Art.* 8. which saith —*the three Creeds ought thoroughly to be received and believed.* This [*and believed*] being added by Queen *Elizabeths* Divines to the former *Article* as it was penned in King *Edwards* dayes; And several of the other *Articles* are required to be assented to as things contained in Scripture, and so as infallible; and these things such,

as

as the Church of *Rome's* errour in them is called *erring* in matter of *faith*; See *Art.* 19. and, since the principal reformation of errours, that belongs to Church-authority, is of those that are contrary to the doctrine of faith (the preservation of which faith is chiefly entrusted to the Church's care), surely it would seem a piece of strange subtilty to ty her Clergy to assent to that, *which is* matter of faith, (in which *faith* also the *Roman* Church hath erred), and yet not to oblige them to assent to it, *as* a matter of faith. If then she doth require Assent to *some* of her *Articles* at least, as of *faith*, upon what ground may a *fallible Authority* do this? and why may not *other* Churches do this as inculpably, as that of *England*? Or, if she doth not require an assent to any of her *Articles* as of faith, of which Bishop *Bramhall* || speaks thus diminutively——*We do use to subscribe to them* [the 39. Articles] *indeed, not as Articles of faith, but as Theological Verities for the preservation of unity among our selves*; then the Clergy of *England*, as to faith, receiving the words of the Creeds, are, as for all other things, permitted to believe what, or how little, they please.

|| *Reply to Chalcedon*, p. 350.

Ib. l. 17. *We cannot help the weakness of those mens understanding who cannot apprehend that any such thing as authority should be left in a Church, if we deny Infallibility; other diseases may be cured, but natural incapacity cannot.* *Non prudentes apud vosmetipsos*, Rom. 12. 16. See *Note* on p. 263. l. (10). and on p. 260. l. 15.

Ib. l. (4) *As that it were the foundation of all the Heresies and Sects in the world.* See before *Note* on p. 263. l. 2.——and on p. 271. l. (2) n. 2.

Ib. l. (3). *This Principle, he saith, makes all Ecclesiastical Authority useless.* *All Ecclesiastical Authority*? N.O. saith not this; frequently imposed upon him by the Dr (See before p. 262. 267.) thereby to shape a thing like an answer to him, in shewing the *Church's Authority* usefull or necessary as to several other things. And the words following here, that are truly cited out of *N.O.* do limit this uselesness of Ecclesiastical Authority to the *Office* of *Teaching*, and that in matters *necessary*, according to Dr *St's.* limitation, in his *Principle*, of the Scriptures being as to these necessaries clear: & the words [*are clear to all persons*] have a limitation also in *N.O.* which he is pleased to leave out, and conceal from his Reader; *viz.* this: *I mean exclusively to their repairing to these Pastors for the learning of the meaning of such Scriptures.*

N. 1. *See Fanaticism fanatically imputed*, p. 99.

Pag. 271. *l.* (2). *For since that Train of my* Principles *hath been laid, nothing like the old Church of* England *hath been seen.* Mr. *S.C.* professeth himself to think more honourably of the *Church* of *England*, than to follow or maintain these *Principles* of

of the *Dr*; and *that the regard Its Governours have both to the King's and Kingdome's ſafety, and their own Character, will not permit them to yield to an Anarchy firſt in the Church, and preſently after in the Kingdome.* He ſaith not, that, ſince the Dr's laying his train &c. nothing like the old Church of *England* hath been ſeen: but that, upon his ground, if received and practiſed in this Church, all would be reduced into meer *Fanaticiſme*: for, ſaith he, §. 91. *——To make every Chriſtian ſoberly enquiring into Scripture to be his own Teacher in all neceſſary points of faith (and it is no matter what becomes of unneceſſary points) and to be a competent Judge of the true ſenſe of Scripture in them: all this without any regard to all External Authority infallible, or fallible either, (for, an infallible one being unneceſſary, what neceſſity can there be of a fallible authority, which none is, or can be, bound to believe?) can be nothing but Fanaticiſme in the heigth of its Notion*: Thus he.

And indeed 1ſt; For matter of fact it is manifeſt, that ſeveral *Sects* of late have much more multiplied in the *Church* of *England*, than in former times. *N. 2.* 2ly. Manifeſt alſo, that, ſince *Chillingworth's* taking this way of anſwering Church-Authority when much preſſed on him, theſe *Principles* have been more in vogue, and more openly maintained; *viz.*——'. That, *For points neceſſary* (and, for others, no matter if controverſy ſtill remains) *Scriptures are clear to all capacities uſing a due diligence therein*: without any expreſſing or explaining of themſelves in this manner; that they mean, uſing a due diligence to be inſtructed by their *Spiritual Paſtor* in the right *ſenſe* thereof; which limitation, ſhould it be added, would ſeem to make more *for Church-Infallibility*, than *againſt* it. Again;——'. *That every Chriſtian is bound to reject whatever is offered to be impoſed upon his faith, which hath no foundation in Scripture; or is contrary thereto*, (as Dr *St.* in his 29th *Principle*:) i.e. (if we make any ſenſe of it), *which* he, & ſuch perſons, do think *hath no foundation in Scripture*, &c. for, if he means here, which the *Church judgeth* to have no foundation in, or to be contrary to, Scripture; ſo ſay *Catholicks*: but, when will the Church judge thus, and impoſe the contrary? Again; *That in the Church all men are left to judge according to the Pandects of the Divine Laws, becauſe each member of this Society is bound to take care of his ſoule, and of all things that tend thereto* ||.——*That men are to try the Doctrines of their Guides, for that many falſe ones are gone out into the world*, &c. See before the Texts urged to this purpoſe by the Dr p. 144. &c. Manifeſt, I ſay, that, more of late, ſuch *propoſitions* and *Principles* as theſe have been much divulged and propagated. But, whether ſuch Principles, or ſome other things,

|| *Rat. Accomm. p.* 133

things, have actually caused such a *licentiousness* in *opinions*, as hath been of late, I cannot determine, only this I may affirm, and do appeale to the candid Reader's judgment therein, that such *Principles* do much invite and encourage such a *Self-guidance* in Spiritual matters, and diffidence in, and independence on, our *Lord's Clergy*: whilst *Chillingworth* freely acknowledgeth; || *if no infallible, then no Ecclesiastical, Judge.* || c. 2. §. 17.

Pag. 273. *l.* 3. *I no where in the least exclude the use of all means and due helps of Guides and others for the understanding the sense of Scripture.* Yes: for the understanding the sense of Scripture *in* all *necessary* Faith. For you both in your *Principles* and in this Book ground the sober Enquirer's not erring in *necessaries* upon the *plainness* of the delivery of (not some, or many; for, this will be granted to you, at least for persons of a good capacity, but) *all* such points in *Scripture*; which plainness in Scripture, where it is, renders an *Expositor* of such *Scripture* needless, upon such *diligence* used. Or, if you mean a plainness by using the help of the Clergy, the plainness now is had not in the Text, but from the Clergy, the mentioning therefore of which by you would have prejudiced such plainness in the *Text*.

Ib. l. 14. *To what purpose in an account of the Principles of Faith should I mention those things which we do not build our faith upon, I mean the Authority of our Guides?* I hope; in your *Principles*, or Foundations of Faith, that you intended to set down all things *necessary* to a Christian's having a true Faith; as in your 13th *Principle* that you intended to set down all things that were necessary, that a sober requirer might not err in necessary Faith, without leaving any of them out Now, a most *exact* and *perfect Rule* of our Faith, if it be not also *clear* to us, requires something besides for our belief of its true sense, namely an *Expositor*, where this *Rule* is *obscure*: and then, that we may not *err* in this our belief, an *Infallible* One. For, the *Scripture* or Principle here, when obscure, abstracted from this Expositor, is of it self indifferent between the sense which we receive, and which we reject. In *obscure* Scripture we resolve our faith into *God's Word* indeed; but, as this is related or expounded to us by the *Church*. And this *Church* therefore is *necessary* to be mentioned, where we speak of the *Resolution* of any such *part* of our *Faith*.

Pag. 274. *l.* (2). *Doth this make the whole Profession of Physick useless?* No. But, If *Hippocrates* his *Aphorisms* are set down so plainly, as that every one, that will take the pains to read and compare them, may understand them, I may safely say, an *Expositor* of these is *useless* to so many, as will take this *pains*.

The

The same is said of *Expositors* as to plain Scriptures. What followes here in him is very true, but nothing to our business.

Pag. 276. *l.* 11. *How comes it now to pass* &c. Mr. *S.C.* pitcheth here, that, as to the knowledge of all *necessary* faith, the guidance of Church-Governours is by Dr *St.* rendred useless. For other matters, how great soever Dr *St.* may make or prove the authority of these Church-Governours to be, he troubles not himself.

Pag. 277. *l.* 7. *S.* Austin *in his books of Christian Doctrine already mentioned.* See before *Note* on p. 236. l. 1.

Ib. l. 9. *And S.* Chrysostom *in as plain words as may be*, &c. || || *Hom.* 3. *in* 2 *Thess.*

S. *Chrysostome's* words in that place reprehending the peoples neglect in the hearing the Scriptures read, if there were no Sermon, (a great fault, which the present times are still subject-to) are these——*Cur, inquit ingredior, si non audio aliquem verba facientem?* [saith he that stayes from Church] *Hoc* [saith the Father] *omnia perdidit, & corrupit. Quid enim opus est aliquo qui verba faciat & sermonem habeat? Ex nostrâ socordiâ hoc usu venit. Quid enim opus est sermone? Omnia sunt dilucida & recta quæ sunt in divinis Scripturis: manifesta sunt, quæcunque sunt necessaria. Sed quoniam estis auditores delectationis, propterea hæc etiam quæritis.* [i.e. Sermons]. Which words, taken in a rigid sense, prove more than Dr *St.* doth pretend to make good out of them; making such a plainness in the Scriptures, as that there is no need of any *Sermons*. But the *Father* seems here, as *Sixtus Senensis* on this place hath observed, not to speak so much of *Dogmata fidei*, (wherein it were strange, if, in all the things that are controverted, and Scriptures urged on both sides, nothing should be a necessary, or that any simple person needed therein no teacher) as of *præcepta Morum, & historiæ sacræ formandis moribus utiles* (his *Sermons* chiefly aiming at the forming of *Manners*, not stating points of *Faith*). And so in another place, where the *Father* speaks much what the same things, he seems to explain himself, in *Concio* 3. *de Lazaro Luc.* 16. ——*Cui enim* (saith he there) *non sunt manifesta, quæcunque in Evangelio scripta sunt? Quis autem audiens beatos esse mites, beatos misericordes, beatos mundicordes, cæteraque hujusmodi, desiderabit præceptorem, ut aliquid eorum discat, quæ dicuntur? Quinetiam signa, miracula, historiæ, nonne cuivis nota manifestaque sunt? Prætextus iste est & causatio, pigritiæque velamentum.* Yet there he supposeth they may meet with difficulties, such wherein it is necessary they should be instructed also; and so adviseth them to repair to a Doctor——*Quod si non peteris* (saith he) *assiduitate lectionis invenire quod dicitur, accede ad sapientiorem; vade ad doctorem, cui unica*

cum his ea quæ scripta sunt; giving them the example of the *Ethiopian Eunuch*. Nay, in this very place cited by the Dr the Father seems to explain himself chiefly of the *clearness* of *Scripture-Stories*, from whence they might learn instruction of *manners*, in the words following; where, replying to those who pretended *obscurity* in the Scriptures read to them, ——*Quænam ea obscura illa?* saith he. *Dic, quæso, annon sunt historiæ? Nostine* [i.e. have you already sufficiently learnt those things] *quæ sunt clara & dilucida* [i.e. that you cannot deny to be so]; *ut de iis, quæ sunt obscura, perconteris* [i.e. afterward]? *Historiæ innumerabiles sunt in Scripturis* [i.e. very plain]. *Dic mihi unam ex illis* &c.

Ib. l. ult. And, for the finding out the sense of Scripture without the help of Infallibility, I have produced more out of Antiquity in this Discourse. He might also as truly say; or *without the help of Church-Authority*, He proceeds.

Pag. 278. l. 2. Than he, or his whole party will be able to answer. Of this let the Reader judge. Meanwhile let us remember the Apostle's advice *Phil. 2. 3. Nihil per inanem gloriam.*

Pag. 279. l. 10. I dare appeale to any person, whether the Bishops deriving their authority from Christ or from the Pope, be the better way of defending their power. These two do well consist; as also doth an *English* Bishop's deriving his authority from *Christ*, and from the *Metropolitan*, and his *Synod*.

Pag. 280. l. 1. If there be any other Power beside the Pope's in the Church, the denying the Pope's Authority cannot in the least diminish the just authority of Bishops. To this, (nothing to *N.O's Considerations*) I say: Let him perform his duty to *Superiour Councils*, and to the *Pope* so far, as he is obliged by the *Church-Canons*; and, concerning any *Controversy* of other *usurped* Authority, let him acquiesce, as a regular Son of the Church, in the Council's Decisions, those as well of any of its *latter* Councils, (so lawful), as of the *former*; and all is well.

Ib. l. 14. *N.O's* words. *Which more Comprehensive Body in any dissent and division of the Clergy according to the Church Canons ought to be obeyed.* It follows in *N.O.* *and which hath hitherto in her supremest and most generally accepted Councils in all ages from the beginning required such submission under penalty of Anathema.* Which words, expressing more plainly what *N.O.* means by *the more comprehensive or universal Body of the Church's Hierarchy*, the Dr omits here; And it seems was willing to mistake his meaning by what he saith below, p. 283.——*That by the more universal Church* N.O. *fairly understands no more, but the Church of* Rome.

Ib. l. (8),

Ibid. (8). *I answer, that the Church of* England *in reforming herself did not oppose any just authority then extant in the world.*

Yes. The Church of *England* then reformed and changed several matters of Doctrine against the *Definitions* of many *former Superiour* Councils, which were accepted and unanimously obeyed by the whole *Body* of the other Churches, *viz.* by all those, that were free from the *Mahometan* yoke, and, among those, by the *Church* of *England* also till *Luthers* appearance; to which *Definition*, and *unanimous consent* of these Churches in them, she stood obliged, as a part to the judgment of the *Whole*: But many of which Doctrines also reformed by her were and are still to this day believed and practised by the *Eastern Churches* also under the *Mahometan* servitude, which he, who is curious to inform himself, may see sufficiently cleared in the 3d *Discourse* Concerning the *Guide in Controversies*, ch. 8.

This then, the departing, in their doctrine, of the two *Metropolitan Churches* of *England* from the greater Body of these many Co-Metropolitan Churches, all accepting and submitting to, the Decisions and Determinations of many former superiour Councils, even all those from the 2d *Nicene*, called the 7th *General* Council, to that of *Trent*, to which Councils the Church of *England* was, and still is, obliged, as well as the rest, and did also submit till the times of *Luther*, is the Discession from the more *Comprehensive* and *universal* Authority, and from the *Holy Catholick Apostolick* Church, (if any then extant), which Catholicks charge upon them. And perhaps it is the consciousness of the truth of this discession, that makes this Author, in several places before, maintain ‖ —*That the Church* [he means *Catholick*] *in any one or more ages since the Apostles times may be deceived*: and † —that, *Universality in any one age of the Church, being taken without the consent of Antiquity, is no sufficient Rule to interpret Scripture by*: and that, when he speaks of standing to the judgment of the Church, he declines that of the *present* Catholick Church, unless joined with the judgment of the Catholick Church of *all ages past* till that of the Apostles; to the *constant* doctrine of *all* which, first *proved* to him, he is content to yield. See for this what he saith by and by ‖ —*But the Church thought otherwise of them. What Church, I pray? The Primitive and Apostolical? that we have always appealed to, and offered to be tried by. The truly Catholick Church of all ages? that we utterly deny to have agreed in any one thing against the Church of* England. And before p. 244. *Let* (saith he) *the Popes Supremacy*, &c *be proved by as universal consent of Antiquity as the Articles of the Creed are, and then let them charge us with*

‖ p. 242.

† p. 241.

‖ p. 282.

Heresy, if we reject them. And p. 259. *Let the same evidences be produced for the consent of the Universal Church from the Apostolical times in the matters in dispute between our Church and that of* Rome, *and that controversy of Infallibility may be laid aside.* Where, still, a *proof* not of the decision of the Catholick Church in some latter age, but of the *Consent* of the *Universal Church* from the *Apostolical* times is demanded for his yielding a submission to it. Nor will the *Judgment* of the *present* Church be current with him for deciding what was the *Consent* of the *former*: the judgment of this he reserves to himself.

Pag. 281. *l.* 1. *The dispute was then concerning the Pope's Supremacy over our Church.* The reforming *Articles* of the Church of *England* not only opposed this, but many other *Definitions* of the *former* Church. But neither could they justly reject this *Supremacy*, so far as it was by the Canons of former superiour Councils established. That only could be ejected that was unjustly usurped.

Ib. l. 11. *Which is sufficiently known to have been the beginning of the breach between the two Churches.* The breach of the Church of *England* in the Reformation was not only from the Communion of the *Roman* concerning the Popes supremacy, but of the *Gallican*, *Spanish*, and all the other *Occidental* or *Oriental Churches* in matters wherein they were united in the Resolutions and Decrees of several former Councils. *Where*, or at what point, the *Breach* began matters not so much, as where it ended; Or, the full charge, that the whole breach contains.

Ib. l. 15. *What should hinder our Church from proceeding in the best way it could for the Reformation of itself?* The Canons and Definitions of former Superiour Councils should hinder the Church from reforming any thing *contrary* to them; as this *Church* did. It follows.

Ib. l. 17. *For the Pope's Supremacy being cast out as an usurpation, our Church was thereby declared to be a free Church.* *The Pope's Supremacy*, established by the Canons of the Church in Superiour Councils, *cast off*? by whom? It can by none lawfully, unless by Church-Councils of equal authority to those that allowed it. *The Church of* England *was thereby declared to be free.* *Free*: what, from the authority of *superiour* Councils, and the *Bishop* of the Prime *Apostolick See* presiding in them? By whom so *freed*? By *Itself*, or by the Governours of this particular Church; i.e. by one member, declaring against the whole? or, by the *Secular Magistrate* abrogating Church-Canons and Constitutions, and Decisions made in Ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs? Neither *valid*. *Ib. l.* (6).

Ib. l. (6). *Authority, to publish Rules and Articles.* But, not contrary to the *Rules* and *Articles* of *Superiour Councils.*

Pag. 282. *l.* 3. *His unjust power was cast off, and that first by Bishops, who in other things adhered to the Roman Church.* Their adhering in other things justifyes not the *Catholick Bishops* for their breach in this. This Author well knows, the first casting off the Pope's power began not at the Bishops; and he hath heard I suppose of their great Reluctance and *Cromwel's* negociations with them, terrifyed upon the charge of having generally incurred a *Premunire*; and of their clause, to have saved themselves—*Quartum per legem Christi licet.*

Ib. l. 17. *We reject nothing but innovations, and reformed nothing but abuses.* By *Innovations* he means innovations established by *the consent of the Universal Church*; from which he raised his objection. And the same appears, by these his words following. *But the Church* [i.e. the Universal Church then extant at the Reformation] *thought otherwise of them*; those called *Innovations*: for if they did not; why did the Reformers depart from the *former Communion?* To which he answers thus—*What Church I pray? The Primitive and Apostolical? that we have always appealed to and offered to be tried by. The truly Catholick Church of all ages? That we utterly deny to have agreed in any one thing against the Church of* England, Here then, we see, his Appeal and retreat is from the *present Church Universal* or its *Councils*, to the *Primitive* and *Apostolical*; and to the truly *Catholick* Church of *all* ages. Well. If we ask now the Question, Who shall judge, Whether the points which the Church of *England* reformed were *Innovatitions* and *Abuses*, as these *Reformers* say; or *Tradition Apostolical* and of the *Primitive* times, as the *present Universal Church* saith; must not the present *Universal Church* judge of it? As, who should judge between S. *Austin* and the *Donatists*, whether Rebaptization or Non-rebaptization was Tradition Apostolical (for, Tradition Apostolicall both willingly admitted) but the then *present* Universal Church? and that to be held for *liquidum* & *eliquatum*, which it concurred in; and It held to have just authority to conclude all its members; and those to be Heretical, that dissented from it? Might the *Donatist* say still after this *Council*, as he here? *What Church thought otherwise?* or thought Rebaptitization unnecessary? The *Primitive* and *Apostolical*, &c? That we deny to have agreed against us in Non-Rebaptization. Meanwhile this Author must either say the Church of *England*, in her *Reformation* opposing the then present *Universal Church*, opposed a just authority then extant; contrary to what he said but now || : || p. 232.

or,

or, that the Authority of this preſent univerſal Church over *England* is not juſt.

Ib. l. (6). *The plain Engliſh of all is, the Church of* Rome *was againſt the Church of* England. If the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in the Reformation was only oppoſed by the *Roman* Church; and between theſe two is all the quarrel; why declines He, as the Reader may ſee he doth, || the then *preſent univerſal Church*, viz.: the other Metropolitan Churches (not only Weſtern, but Eaſtern), diſtinct from the *Roman*? Namely the *Metropolitan* Churches of *France*, *Spain*, *Germany*, &c and thoſe of *Italy* alſo, that are under other States than the *Pope's*, all theſe as well as the *Roman* being againſt the Tenents of the Reformation; and ſo the *Engliſh Church* too, till the time? If a much major part of ſuch Metropolitan Churches conſenting in ſome doctrines cannot conclude herein one or two diſſenting from them, How could the *Donatiſt-Churches* in *Africk* be concluded by the reſt? Or, *Dioſcorus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* and the *Egyptian* Churches by the *Council* of *Chalcedon*? Had not the *Donatiſts* as fair a pretence to call all thoſe that oppoſed them the *Roman* Church, as this Author hath? For, all theſe that agreed againſt them were united under the *Preſidency* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; and with *Stephen Biſhop of Rome*, at firſt, was their main conteſt.

|| *See Note on p.280. l.* (8).

Pag. 283. *l.* 5. *But doth he undertake to make this good*, &c. See *Note* on p. 280. l. (8). to avoid ſo frequent Repetitions.

Ib. l. 12. *By the more univerſal Church he fairly underſtands no more but the Church of* Rome. This he will ſay, Whereas the words, he leaves out in his quotation of *N.O.* name expreſly *the Church's moſt ſupreme and moſt generally accepted Councils*; and the *Church* of *Rome* is not there mentioned at all.

Ib. l. (4). *For the firſt*, [the Pope and the Councils of the Roman Church] *we owe no obedience to them.* See *Note* on p. 282. *l.* 17. and *l.* (6). I hope, if the Church of *England* owes no obedience to a Council of the *Roman* Church, yet it doth to a *Patriarchal Council* of the *Occidental Churches*.

Ib. l. (3). *For the ſecond* [a General Council], *there was no ſuch thing then in the world* [at the coming of *Luther*] *and therefore could not be oppoſed.* No more was that of *Nice*, or the other Three *firſt Councils* then extant in the world; and yet I hope the *Church* of *England* then owed obedience to them. But, their *Definitions* were then extant contrary to the Doctrine of the *Reformation*: But, the *unanimous conſent* of all the other Churches conforming in their belief and practice to the deciſions of former Councils was then extant. Which Conſent of other Weſtern Churches

Churches was alſo teſtified in thoſe very times in the *Council of Trent* without the leaſt pretended *force* uſed upon thoſe *Churches*, as to the moſt of the *Proteſtant Tenents* condemned there; as may appear to any one in *Soave's* Hiſtory of that Council: for, indeed, theſe Biſhops voted in it what things were their common practice before it: and the Definitions thereof as to theſe points are Generally accepted and held in theſe Churches.

Pag. 284. *l.* 2. *No Church hath been more guilty of a violation of them, than the Church of* Rome. Were it ſo, How doth this excuſe you, that another is faulty beſides you?

Ib. l. 6. *We are no enemies to the ancient Patriarchal Government of the Chriſtian Church.* *No enemies*, is not enough, where we ought to be *Subjects*.

Ib. l. 12. *And all Chriſtendom would conſent to a truly free and General Council.* If ſuch Council were called, will you ſubmit your judgment to its *definitions*? I trow not. Let your obedience be ſhewed to *former* lawful Superiour Councils, and it may be hoped, to the *future*. He goes on.

Ib. l. 14. *Which we look on as the beſt expedient on earth, for compoſing the differences of the Chriſtian world, if it might be had.*

You look upon it *as the beſt expedient &c*; but, take care to clog it with ſuch unpracticable *conditions* to be a right and current General one, as you will be ſure never to meet with *any ſuch expedient to compoſe your differences*, or to have your approbation for ſuch. And from the complaints you make (ſuch as theſe which follow here) concerning thoſe *Councils* that have been held, we may expect, for theſe hereafter, defects abundant in thoſe that are not for your turn: *Titular Patriarchs*, or *Popes Penſioners*, or at the leaſt *Combinations* of *intereſted* Parties [*i.e.* of an intereſt, in Controverſies of Religion, contrary to yours; as theſe judging, when met in Council, what they believed and practiſed before them]. And would not one think that the firſt *four Councils* do hardly paſs through your Sieve, when you ſpeak thus to your Adverſary, *Rational Account.* p. 253. *Have Paſtors and Doctors met in Oecumenical Councils in all ages? I would you could prove a truly* Oecumenical *Council in any age?* He proceeds.

Ib. l. 17. *But we cannot endure to be abuſed by meer names of Titular Prtriarchs with Combinations of intereſted Parties inſtead of General Councils.* You do well in this. But, not ſo, if you charge any ſuch things on thoſe former Councils, whereof the more univerſal judgment of other Metropolitan Churches cleareth them, in their accepting them for *lawful* and *obliging*; and conforming in their belief and practice to their *Decrees*: which

General

general acknowledgment of them ſupplies alſo any defect, that might have been in the management of them.

Ib. l. (3). *If we then oppoſe ſo general a conſent of the Chriſtian Church let them charge us with not ſubmitting to all the Authority extant of the world.* And what then; when you are ‖ p.241,242 ſo charged? Then you will ſay, as you have ſaid ‖ —*That the Church in any one or more ages ſince the Apoſtles times may be deceived.* And—*That univerſality in any one age without the Conſent of Antiquity* [which Conſent you, not It, ſhall judge of] *is no ſufficient Rule to interpret Scripture by, nor conſequently to decide the Controverſies ariſing therein.*

Pag. 285. *l.* 6 *And every free Church &c.* See *Note* on p. 281. l. 1. It follows.

Ib. l. 9. *Hath a ſufficient power to reform all abuſes within it ſelf when a more general conſent cannot be obtained.* But, not to *reform* any thing *contrary* to ſuch doctrines *&c*, to which a more general conſent hath already been obtained in ſeveral Councils, that, before the Church was divided, were *generally* received. A *Metropolitan Church* may have a ſufficient power to reform ſomthing *without*, but nothing *contrary* to, the *Deciſions* or Canons of a *Superiour* Authority.

Ib. l. 14. *How very pitiful an advantage can from hence be made by the diſſenting parties among us?* For the advantages diſſenting parties make hence, ſee before *Note* on p. 180. l. 9.—p. 263. l. 2.—p. 271. l. (2). It follows.

Ib. l. (12). *Who decry that Patriarchal, and ancient Government as Antichriſtian which we allow as prudent and Chriſtian.*

But doth this Author allow it as of Divine Inſtitution, and neceſſary? I mean, the Government of the Church by *Biſhops*.

Ib. l. (9). *N.O. ſaith, my* Principles *afford no effectual way or means in this Church of ſuppreſſing or convicting any Schiſme, Sect, or Hereſy, or reducing them either to ſubmiſſion of judgment or ſilence: Therefore my* Principles *are deſtructive to all Church-Authority. Deſtructive to all authority:* N.O. makes no ſuch Conſequence. But the immediate words following thoſe cited by our ‖ *Princip. Conſid.* p. 98. Author are theſe. ‖ *For, where both ſides contend Scripture clear for themſelves, the clearneſs of ſuch Scripture, how great ſoever on one ſide, can be made no inſtrument of conviction to the other. Here therefore things muſt be proſecuted further than Scripture, to a Dic Eccleſia.* And then, for the convicting and ſuppreſſing ſuch Hereſies and Schiſmes this Church, appealed and complained to, muſt have *authority* and *infallibility*, at leaſt as to *neceſſaries*, to decide truly ſuch *conteſts* about the ſenſe of *Scripture*, (which may happen

pen to be in them); and justly to punish with her censures, as she useth to do, those that are *Hereticks*, *i.e.* dissenters from her definitions; and so preserve the Church in the *unity* of the true *Faith*; things denied to it by the Dr.

Ib. l.(2). *The design of my* Principles *was to lay down the Foundations of faith, and not the means of suppressing Heresies.*

But his *Principles*, laying down the foundations of *Faith*, if good, must be such as consist with the foundations of *Peace* also, and with the means of suppressing *Heresies*. And, to his Instances I say, *Aristotle* may be justly blamed for his *Logick*; or *Hippocrates* for his *Aphorismes*; if the one be found to contain any thing contrary to *Civil* Government; or the other to the *Colledge of Physicians*.

*Pag.*286. *l.*(2). *We are sure the meer authority of their Church hath been no more effectual means* [of suppressing sects] *than that of ours hath been.* I think He hath yielded the contrary before *p.*136. where, being pressed, that the *subjects* of the *Roman Church*, however their other private opinions may differ, do all submit their judgments to the *determinations* of her *Councils*, which takes away all Divisions in her as to such matters, this being not so in the Church of *England*, he hath these words——*I do not say, that the Church of* Rome *hath no advantage at all in point of Unity; but, that all the advantage it hath comes from force and fraud* [viz. such force as the Council of *Nice* used to its subjects *viz.* Anathemas to Dissenters]. And——*We do not envy them the effects of tyranny and deceit. It is the Union of Christians we contend for, & not of Slaves or Fools.* And ——*I freely yield that they have a juster pretence to Unity without Truth, than we.* Where, this effect, *a greater Unity*, is granted by him; but, that this is *without Truth*, is denied by us. But, setting this aside, we contend; that, where it is affirmed, 1. That *Scriptures* are so *cleare* in all *necessaries*, that none, of what condition soever, using their right endeavour to understand them, can *mistake*: 2. And again; that there is no other *Infallible Judge* to determine certainly any sense of Scripture in such *necessaries* where it is controverted; nor, which may require submission of judgment from their subjects to their *sentence*; and so, the people left to their own judgment; one man, upon using, as he thinks, a just endeavour, being confident of one sense of Scripture plain to him, another of the contrary, which judgment of *particulars* the Church, fallible, hath no power to sway or correct; Nor, on the other hand the *Scripture* doth decide to them at all, *on which side* it is cleare; Here, we say, is left no effectual way (which yet always the *Church* must have; one, or other for clearing and purging itself of *Heresies* and *Schisms*), by which the opinion of either

N. 1.

N. 2.

either of these, and so of any *Sect* of them erring in some necessary points, or by which any *Heresy*, may be suppressed, or the persons so perswaded severed from the Church's Communion; and so the *Principles* must be unsound, that inferr such *Consequences*.

N. 3. But, there is such an effectual way in the Church; which is maintained to have power (as it is by Catholicks) to determine, in all Controversies about necessaries (and in this, amongst others, concerning the *Apostolicalness* of a former *Tradition*, or the *legitimacy* of a former *Council*,) what doctrine is true and Apostolical; and to Anathematize all Dissenters; whereby she either reduceth *Sectarists*, if *submitting* to her judgment, or separateth them from the Church, if *opposing* it. And such way accords very well with our Lords——*Sit tibi sicut Ethnicus & Publicanus:* and with S. *Paul's*——*In promptu habens ulcisci omnem inobedientiam*; &——*Hæreticum hominem devita*, because αὐτοκατάκριτος *self-condemned.* [i.e. as Dr *Hammond* on the place, *his very being a spontaneous* καθαίρεσις *excision from, and disobedience to, the Church*]. And——*Tradidi Satanæ, ut discant non blasphemare*——*quorum sermo, saith he serpit ut cancer.* And with his ——*Auferte malum ex vobis ipsis*, Because *Modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit.* And——*Quos* [*inobedientes & seductores*] *oportet ἐπιστομίζειν*, because else *universas domos subvertunt.* [And indeed, where liberty is unrestrained, it is a folly to think any will hold, that will not also speak of, an opinion]. And again accords well with S. *John's*——*Non Ave ei dixeritis*: And——*Ut non communicetis operibus ejus malignis.* The like to which we find in the *law* of *Moses*; *Deut.* 17. 12. &c.——*Qui autem superbierit, nolens obedire sacerdotis imperio* &c. *ex decreto judicis morietur homo ille.* And——*Cunctus populus audiens timebit, ut nullus deinceps intumescat superbiâ* [in his own opinion and judgment.] By such means it is, that both the Unity of the Church's *Faith* is always preserved; and no Sects or Heresies permitted within her to disturbe her *Peace*, or further infect her Children. See before, *Note* on p. 263. l. 2.

Pag. 287. *l.* 2. *There is another means they use which is far more effectual*, viz. *the Inquisition.* An *effectual* (however justifiable) *means* Catholicks have besides, and without, the *Inquisition*, confessed, I think, by this Author's former words quoted before ‖. And this means of the *Inquisition*, however effective, the most of the *Catholick Churches* do not, or have never used. But here the Reader may observe, How this Author in stead of refuting, or mentioning here *N.O's* effectual means so often inculcated in his *Considerations* on his Principles, and but now repeated,

‖ *Note on p.* 286. *l.* (2.)

peated, hooks in the Inquiſition, as a more plauſible ſubject wherewith to entertain and amuſe his *Proteſtant* Reader.

Ib. l. 5. *God keep us from ſo barbarous and diabolical a means of ſuppreſſing Schiſms.* *Barbarous*, and *diabolical?* If this Author's judgment ſhould happen not to be right here, let him conſider what an account he is to give for theſe words and his following Raillery ſo liberally inveighing againſt *Church Authority*. There will always many be offended (becauſe many faulty, and all, lovers of liberty) with a ſtrict Government, and ſuch as executes the laws, in Church or State. And ſo did the *High-Commiſſion-Court* here diſpleaſe eſpecially the Sectariſts. It concerns not *N.O.* to abett the *Inquiſition*; yet, barring here *particular perſonal* Acts, all which no *Religion* undertakes to juſtify, in its *ſubjects*, I ſee no great cauſe why this Author ſhould be ſo incenſed againſt it, ſo long as the delegated power to theſe *extraordinary* Officers in proceeding againſt Hereticks doth not tranſcend that, which by the *Canons* and Conſtitutions of the *Church* belongeth to the *ordinary* Judges thereof: and, if what theſe act according to theſe *Canons* be not juſt, the *Canons*, not they, are therein culpable. Of the Equity of which *Canons* ſurely the *Councils* that made them are more proper and abler Judges, than this Author, or my ſelf. All the ſeverity of this extraordinary Office lies in putting theſe *Canons* in *execution* when the ordinary Curators thereof neglect it; and that in ſuch a Church or State where an endeavour is uſed rather to prevent *Hereſy* thereby (which, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *ſerpit ut cancer*, and, *corrumpit ut fermentum*) when a few only as yet are infected therewith, and may happen to ſuffer; than to pluck it up, where it hath taken any deep and long root, and is grown very numerous. As for the *fire* and *faggots* our Authour brings in by and by; what *temporal* puniſhments are inflicted on ſuch offenders, are ſo by the order and authority of the *Prince*, to whom in ſuch place belongs the *temporal ſword*. And, for the *Juſtice* that may be ſhewed in ſuch puniſhments (if it may not be called *Mercy* rather to *Chriſtianity* in General; eſpecially, where the *Hereſy* is diſcovered pernicious to Godlineſs, or alſo blaſphemous againſt the Deity, and when by it greater miſchief is thought done to mens Souls, than by Thieves or robbers to their eſtates or lives), the example herein of *Proteſtant Princes* alſo may be produced to warrant it: and ſeveral ſuch Hereticks here in *England* have been put to death; and more condemned to be ſo, both in King *Edwards*, Queen *Elizabeths*, and King *James* his days.

Pag. 288. *l.* (4). *It is truly ſaid of Pope* Paul 4. *&c.* Mens

Words are not to be put upon the rack. If *Paul* 4. said this, we *see* the contrary: *viz.* the Authority of the *Roman* See maintained where is no *Inquisition*. It is true that *Paul* the 4th, as also *Philip* the 2d King of *Spain* relied much on the diligence of these extraordinary Officers as an effective way of suppressing *Heresy*; but it must be in a Church not much infected herewith; and where the delinquents are as yet not numerous.

Pag. 289. *l.* (2). *Which made one of the Inquisitours in* Italy *complain*, &c. This *Busdragus* his letter to I know not what Cardinal of *Pisa* my small skill in books knows not where to find. But the *Inquisition* in *Italy* being only in the *Popes* Dominions, never noted to have abounded much with *Lutherans*, and that only executed on Natives, who having been sometimes Catholicks are revolted, the matter which our Author hath taken out of it, *viz.* that in *forty* years, there, an *hundred thousand* persons had been destroyed for *Heresy*, i.e. 2500 *per annum*, which is a number more suitable to the justice of a Battle, than of a Court of *Inquisition*, (whereas in that small state, the execution of the tenth part thereof for what crimes soever will hardly pass for a truth); and, again, that since this depopulation (if I may so call it) *Heresy*, there, is extremely strengthned and increased, are things so notoriously *incredible*, as, though some person might have the imprudence to write it (which I will not question, because the Dr saith it) yet He might have chosen some currenter matter elsewhere, than quoted it.

Pag. 290. *l.* 10. *But we recommend, as much as they can do, to the people the vertues of Humility, Obedience, due submission to their spiritual Pastors and Governours.* That which *N.O.* complains to be neglected, by Protestants, and which is necessary for curing sects and schisms, is more than this Author here mentions or will allow, *viz.*; (to give you it in *N.O.'s* own words)

N. 1.

Princip. Consid. p. 99 ——*That it is necessary to recommend (especially to the illiterate and lesse intelligent common sort of people) Humility, Obedience, and submission of Judgement to their spiritual Pastors and Governours, whom our Lord hath ordained by due succession to continue to the end of the world on purpose to expound the Scriptures, and out of these to teach them all Necessaries for their salvation, and to keep them stable and fixed from being tossed to and fro with every winde of doctrine, that capricious fancies may imagine there, or malicious pretend; Necessary, to inform them that are to learn of these Pastors the true sense of Gods Word, according to former Church-Tradition; and that they are to* rest in their judgement [as Dr *Field* hath it] *and* follow their faith (*as the* Apostle ‖); *that they may not usurp their Office,*

‖ *Heb.* 13. 7.

&c.

&c. *Laſtly, that, ſuppoſing theſe Guides alſo ſhould erre, yet it is better for them ſtill that all erre one errour, which is the errour of their Guides; becauſe there will be at leaſt ſome unity and peace in that, and ſome excuſe for the errour of Inferiours; yea alſo in probability, more veriſimilitude; than that every one ſhould erre a ſeveral, and his own errour, to the utter ruine of Peace, and a greater deviation from Truth.* But that which our Authour hath changed here, and in ſtead of *ſubmiſſion of judgement* put only in general terms *due obedience and ſubmiſſion*, and this *due* to be ſtated, as I apprehend, not by theſe Governours, but thoſe that owe it, leaves all *Sects* ſtill to enjoy their own tenents, how abſurd or impious ſoever, and with theſe alſo to enjoy the *Communion* of the *Church*, notwithſtanding *a due ſubmiſſion* called for by it. So that its ſubjects are ſtill left to be toſſed to and fro with every wind of doctrine that blowes, though, the *Apoſtle* ſaith, God hath appointed *Governours* to prevent it; nor are tied to follow the Faith of their *Guides*, as the *Apoſtle* requires; nor to learn the *ſenſe* of *Scripture*, where this is diſputed, from thoſe whom our Lord hath appointed to *teach* it them. So that, notwithſtanding this latter defence made here by this Author, I ſee no reaſon but that I may conclude theſe *Notes* on his *Reply*, as *N.O.* doth his *Conſiderations* on his *Principles*.

That, ſince it is the Church's Authority *that muſt rectify ſuch diverſity of Opinions, for the attaining* unity *and* peace *in the points controverted, this* Authority *is neceſſary in the firſt place to be eſtabliſhed, in ſtead of leaving every fancy to* perſpicuity *of* Scripture. *And that the prudent may conſider, whether the authority of a Church muſt not neceſſarily be much debilitated and brought into contempt, and dailylike to wane more and more, where ſuch a new way is taken up of its Defence, that he thinks himſelf its beſt Advocate and Pleader of its cauſe, who doth moſt endeavour to ſet forth the defects and failings of all Eccleſiaſtical Societies, Prelates, and Councils,* [in which office I appeale to the candid and equal Reader whether this Author hath not in this Diſcourſe vigorouſly emploied his Pen]; *and who beſt proves no Scripture-Promiſes made to them: Nay, where, to the end to evacuate the Infallibility of any Society or Church in Neceſſaries, is ſet up a Counter-Lay-Infallibility of private men, if onely ſincere endeavourers, for underſtanding Holy Writ, in all the ſame Neceſſaries. Where therefore ſuch new Maxims are ſtill ſpread abroad and received with applauſe (which were firſt made more current and common by Mr* Chillingworth, *forced to it as the laſt refuge left to ſhelter him from Obedience to a juſt Church-Authority) it is no great wonder if the broachers of new Sects,*

and

and extravagant fancies in Religion, the Contemners of Church-Authority, and of the Clergy, (who first contemned and vilified themselves) do daily in such parts so exceedingly multiply and increase. Sed Tu, Pastor Bone, adduc istas oves perditas in Ovile tuum; ut vocem tuam audiant: & fiat unum Ovile, & unus Pastor. Amen.

Pag. 290 *l.ult*; Dr *St's* Conclusion. *I have thus far considered the main Foundations, upon which* N.O. *proceeds in opposition to my* Principles, *there is now very little remaining which deserves any notice: and that which seems to do it, as about Negative Articles of Faith, and the Marks of the true Church, I shall have occasion to handle them at large in the following Discourse.* I have perused his following *Discourse in Vindication of the Protestants Grounds of faith* and find nothing answered to what *N.O.* hath objected p. 76. concerning the Protestants *Negative Articles* of *Faith*; or hath urged p. 86. concerning the *Marks* or evidences by which among many pretenders, that *Church* may be known; from which known we are to learn *Truth*. But I wonder not at it, since in this Discourse pretending to answer *N.O's Considerations*; no reply is returned to a greater part of them: Nor the *arguings* in his *Principles* justified, where they are by *N.O.* questioned. Which perhaps may be the reason, why he saith here only, *that he hath thus far considered the main Foundations upon which* N.O. *proceeds*: the Structure it self remains yet unconsidered: and, as for his digging here at the *Foundation*, it hath been but lost labour; If *the Church* be a sure *Foundation*, *N.O's* must stand.

FINIS.